

AN  
EXAMINATION  
OF THE  
Principles advanced  
IN THE  
Lord Bishop of *London's* SERMONS, &c.



EXAMINATION

Principles advanced

854. b 11

H Sherlock (P) Bk

12. 2. f.  
10. A.A.k.

A FREE AND CANDID  
EXAMINATION  
OF THE  
Principles advanced

IN THE  
Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of LONDON'S  
very elegant SERMONS, lately published;

And in his very interesting  
DISCOURSES ON PROPHECY.

The commonly received SYSTEM, concerning  
the Natures of the JEWISH and CHRISTIAN  
Dispensations, is particularly considered:

With occasional OBSERVATIONS on some late  
Explanations of the Doctrines therein contained.

---

BY

The AUTHOR of *The Critical Enquiry into the  
Opinions and Practice of the Ancient Philoso-  
phers, &c.*

---

L O N D O N,

Printed for LOCKYER DAVIS and CHARLES  
REYMERS, against Grays-Inn-Gate in Holborn,  
Printers to the ROYAL SOCIETY. MDCCLVI.

4



EXAMINATION

OF THE

PRINCIPLES

OF THE

ARTS

AND

SCIENCE

OF THE

UNIVERSITY

OF

OXFORD

IN

THE

YEAR

1850



389

P R E F A C E.

**R**EASON, in religious matters, stands but an ill chance of being heard; when one part of the public attention is engaged in the gratifications of *sense*; another busied in the visionary pursuits of an *over-heated fancy*; and the rest is securely reposing in the cool and venerable shade of **AUTHORITY**.

In the tumultuous scenes of life, the voice of Reason is too weak to be heard; or too difficult to be understood: In the indulgent anarchy of Fancy, her language is too simple or too severe to persuade; but where **AUTHORITY** bears sway, she is en-



## ii P R E F A C E.

joined compliance; or reduced to silence.

Thus, we see, in one quarter she is stared-at as a Stranger; in another, she alarms as an Enemy; and in the third, she is treated as a Slave. Here indeed, her case is at the worst. She may familiarize herself to the sensual man; she may be reconciled to the Visionary; but, with AUTHORITY, she can come to no composition; tho' she be unable to withstand its power. And yet it is against this last FOE TO REASON, that the following sheets are chiefly directed.

But, to vindicate the *rights of Reason in religion*, appears now so desperate an adventure to the learned of Oxford; that in a sudden fit of despair, as it should seem, they are for giving up the cause at once; and ridding us of all our labour, at a blow. The scheme is to expell REASON out of

• See a sermon called *The Christian Apology*: the

# P R E F A C E. iii

the province of FAITH; and to believe on no other account, but because it is *thus written*: That the DATA for the truths of Revelation are so slender, that the application of human Reason to it only makes it totter the more; for that all which human Reason can do is to furnish out TOPICAL arguments; which as they have two handles, two faces, and two edges, are laid hold on equally by the two Parties; who with the same ease and facility turn them against one another, till the conflict ends in an universal scepticism. The learned Doctor, who has made this important discovery, concludes therefore; that human Reason is that carnal weapon, which the Apostolic men most of all disclaimed; and which it is now preached before the University of Oxford at St. Mary's, on Aet-funday in the afternoon, July 13, 1753. by Thomas Patten, D. D. Fellow of Corpus-Christi College. *Published at the request of the Vice-Chancellor, and other Heads of Houses.*



iv P R E F A C E

high time, after having done so much mischief with it, to throw finally aside.

It may be said, perhaps; Why such resentment against Reason at this juncture? There is not so much of it, as to be troublesome to any body: and what there is, is not so well received; as to excite envy. But this shews the disinterestedness of the Projector. And if he may appear ungenerous to take advantage of her present low defenseless condition, to exclude her from her pretended rights; it is all for the Public good. Be this as it may. For my own part, I cannot but wish his project good success. Reason has so little befriended me, and I suppose it is the case of many others; that I am ready to cry out, (as a certain person did against something he thought her enemy) *Would we were well rid of it.* But this shews us, we ought to do nothing rashly. In my mind, these two projects should go hand in hand; that

## P R E F A C E. v

that when we have driven REASON out of Religion, we may take care to leave none of those absurdities behind; which afford her so plausible a pretence for staying where she is, to prevent matters from growing worse, when she can make them no better.

This appears to me, a defect in the learned Doctor's scheme: but not the only one. He would have us lay aside our Reason. In good time. But, let us first see, whether he can persuade our Adversaries to the same complaisance. If he cannot, Why should the defenders of religion, throw aside their weapons? Bad arms are better than none. Oh, but the *Reason* of Unbelievers is such adulterate stuff, such very false mettle, that no great harm is to be apprehended from it. Now to my thinking, here is one cause the more, for not parting with ours in a hurry. Counters have never so good a chance of passing current,

as



vi P R E F A C E

as when we have no Sterling money to confront with them.

There is still more behind. The subtle Doctor has apparently communicated but one half of his Scheme; and mysteriously keeps the other in reserve: for we can never suppose, his intention is to leave Religion quite defenseless. *Human Reason*, I will beg leave to call, the **FORTRESS OF FAITH**; it is, you will say, full of weak places. Be it so. It has still its advantages; or a known Enemy of Revelation, (tho' in masquerade, as usual) would never have been at all that pains to draw us out of it. This was all he wanted; to insult us, at pleasure; and he played his part well. But we can never suppose; that the learned Doctor, tho' he treads in his steps, is going his way. We must conclude therefore; that tho' he has

<sup>b</sup> See the book called, *Christianity not founded on argument*.

# P R E F A C E.      vii

not thought fit to tell us what security he has provided for *Religion*, yet at least that something he has in petto, ready to supply the place of *Reason*; as soon as ever we shall be disposed to give it up.

Now, what this something is, we can but guess. There are two famous Sects of nominal Christians; to whom *Reason* having given as great offence, as it has happened to do to our learned Doctor; they have both acted on his exterminating principle. The Sects I mean are the *QUAKERS* and the *PAPISTS*; but then, both of them have, in their several ways, provided for the security of *Religion*; in the absence, or during the captivity of *Reason*.

The Quakers have substituted the *SPIRIT* in its stead. And, indeed, suppose them not to have juggled with us; and they have made no ill exchange for us. "Why should you wretched earth-worms (say these men

to



to us) keep groping out your way by the weak and feeble glimmering of *human Reason*, when you have the *light within*; the glorious light of the Spirit rising in your souls? Reason indeed is good, when nothing better can be had. It served the Philosophers. But shall their old stale ware serve the Saints? *Purge out, for shame, this old leaven; that you may be a new LUMP.* Now, these Illuminati ascribing so much more to human REASON than our Oxford Divine, and indeed talking so much more soberly concerning it, I conclude that the thing which he keeps in reserve, and is so shy of producing, is not the SPIRIT.

It remains then to see, if it be that with which the PAPISTS have done such wonders. I mean, the ARM OF FLESH; whether distinguished by the titles of *Inquisitions, wholesome Severities, solemn Leagues and Covenants, Acts of Conformity*, or by what other name whatsoever it may be called; as differ-

I

rent

## P R E F A C E. ix

rent times and places hold most commodious or salutary. Now there are many circumstances, which plainly indicate the *great secret* to be this, and no other. For 1st. the learned Doctor agrees with them, in the most lavish abuses of *human Reason*; especially, when it submits to the guidance of private judgment. 2dly, His spite and rancour, like theirs, is chiefly directed against such, whom *human Reason* is supposed to have favoured most. 3dly, He condescends, as the Papists have ever done, (and which the *Quakers*, to do them justice, never did) to borrow aid of this *Enemy of all godliness*; as often as it may serve his purpose. From the sameness in these various characteristic marks I am inclined, and I hope without breach of charity, to conclude; that the learned Doctor's prime object, like theirs, is the *peace*, rather than the *purity*, of Religion: and consequently, that he has a more substantial support for the CHURCH, than



## x P R E F A C E.

than that slender pillar of the *light within*: which, when he pleases to explain at large, he will, without all question, meet with the encouragement he deserves.

But it is time to return from whence we set out; and make one desperate effort more, with this feeble instrument of REASON, even there, where, at best, she never did much; I mean, against AUTHORITY.

C O N

# CONTENTS.

## CHAP. I.

*Shewing that the commonly received system concerning the natures of the two dispensations, as far as respects a future state, is inconsistent with the history of the Old Testament, and with the doctrine of the New,*

P. 1.

## CHAP. II.

*Remarks on the Bishop of London's defence of the ancient prophecies; with some observations on what has been lately advanced by Dr. Middleton, and Dr. Sykes, on the subject of types and secondary prophecies,*

P. 92.

## CHAP. III.

*Containing some reflections on the Bishop of London's second dissertation, or his explanation and account of the book of Job. In which it is shewn that a scrupulous adherence to the common system concerning the nature of the two dispensations has betrayed his Lordship into much confusion, perplexity, and embarrass,*

P. 154.

## CHAP.



## CHAP. IV.

*Wherein my Lord Bishop of London's account of the particular end and design of the Jewish Law is considered; and shewn to be inconsistent with the nature of a preparatory religion, and also with several passages of the New Testament, as well as with his Lordship's sermons and discourses on prophecy,*

P. 225.

## CHAP. V.

*Containing an enquiry, how far the doctrine advanced in my Lord Bishop's sixth sermon, affects the argument of the DIVINE LEGATION; how far it tends to establish the credit of MOSES, and the PROPHETS: and how far it is consistent with the other parts of his Lordship's theological system,*

P. 264.

## CHAP. II.

## ADDENDA.

P. 361.

## CHAP. III.

N

A N

# EXAMINATION, &c.

## CHAP. I.

*Shewing that the commonly received System concerning the natures of the two Dispensations, as far as respects a future state, is inconsistent with the history of the Old Testament; and with the doctrine of the New.*

**I**T is generally supposed by the advocates of the common System; that the great and leading principles of the Gospel were revealed, by Moses and the Prophets, to the ancient Jewish people; and that the doctrine of life and immortality was as much the foundation and support of their religion as now. For that no dispensation of religion, of which this doctrine was not a fundamental and essential part, would have been able to subsist in any age or period of the



world. We are commonly told; that not only future rewards and punishments, but even the *resurrection of the body*, was a popular and common notion; taught and publickly cultivated in the earliest ages of the *Jewish* church. However, a very eminent writer, and chief support of the common System, seems to be of opinion, that the hypothesis is pushed much too far; and contents himself with only asserting, that *the ancient Revelations afforded a good proof of a future state*, without extending it to the resurrection; *which was reserved to be revealed by Jesus Christ*.

We may reasonably presume, the common System has now received all the advantage and improvement of which it is capable; after having been revised and re-touched by the hand of so great a master. How far it may be able, as it is now qualified, to withstand the attacks of the celebrated writer, who had so successfully exposed it; or how far the learned Prelate has succeeded in his attempts to *restore and re-establish* its sinking credit; will appear from the following sheets.

I, who am a bare looker-on, and absolutely disengaged from all that bias of affection which is so wont to warp the followers of an

• Bishop of London's sermons, vol. i. sermon 6th.

old

old system, or the inventors of a new; have done my best to examine this question with all impartiality: and my great objection to the common System has ever been; that it supposes the *Jews* were more enlightened, and better instructed in the great truths and principles of the Gospel, than is consistent with the account they give of themselves in the Old Testament; or the account given of their dispensation in the New.

I will begin my inquiry with the latter.

“God, (says St. Paul) hath saved us, according to his own purpose and his grace, which was given us in *Christ Jesus*, before the world began;

“But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour *Jesus Christ*, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light, through the Gospel.”

We are told, that God, before the world began, had decreed to restore mankind to that lost inheritance of eternal life, which they should forfeit by the disobedience of our first parents. It is added, that this secret purpose and design was now at last “made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour *Jesus Christ*, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light, through

2 Tim. i. 9, 10.



"the Gospel." The word, which we here translate *make manifest*, is often used in the New Testament to signify the opening and unfolding a *mystery*; or the discovery of a thing which was absolutely unknown before. Which will naturally lead us to conclude, that the purpose of redeeming mankind had been a *mystery*, kept secret and hid in the divine breast, before its publication in the Gospel.

St. Paul mentions *two* periods; *one*, when it was originally formed in the secret counsels of God; and the *other*, when it was published and revealed. The opposition between these two states seem necessarily to imply, that during the interval it remained a secret.

If the Apostle may be allowed to be his own interpreter, it will be easy to establish this exposition by a parallel passage in the Epistle to Titus. "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised be-

Ἐποσθεν καὶ χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων, φανερωθεῖσαν δὲ νῦν διὰ τῆς ἐπιφάνειας τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, Ἐφ. 2 Tim. i. 9, 10.

The word (φανερω) is applied to the opening and unfolding of a mystery, of a thing absolutely unknown before; *Romans* xvi. 25, 26. *Colossians* i. 26. *1 Pet.* i. 20. *Hebrews* ix. 8.

Grotius on the words *made manifest* (manifestata est autem nunc) says, *propositum illud diu in Deo latuit; nunc vero patefactum est. φανερον est revelare.*

"fore

“fore the world began; but hath in due  
 “times *manifested* his word through preach-  
 “ing.”

Here too we are told, that God *promised*,  
*i. e.* decreed or determined within himself,  
 to promise eternal life, before the beginning of  
 the world; but that the *manifestation* of his  
 purpose was reserved for the ministry of his  
 Son. Consequently, that, during the inter-  
 val, it remained a *secret* within the divine  
 breast, and a *mystery* to man.

Agreeably to this exposition, the Author of  
 the epistle to the *Hebrews* assures us, that  
 “the great salvation of the Gospel (*i. e.* the  
 promise of eternal life) “*first began* to be  
 “spoken by the Lord”. But how could  
*Jesus* be the *first* who taught this doctrine, if  
*Moses* and the Prophets had taught it long  
 before? Or how did he *begin* to speak of that,  
 which so many others had been commission-  
 ed to teach before him.

Sometimes we are told, that life and im-  
 mortality was *brought to light*; sometimes,  
 that it was *made manifest*; and sometimes,  
 that it *first began* to be spoken, by *Jesus*  
*Christ*. The *bringing to light*, and the *ma-*  
*king manifest*, are phrases equivalent to the  
 other of *beginning first to teach*. And if so,

<sup>d</sup> c. ii. 3.

B 3

the



the publication ascribed to *Jesus Christ* must have been the first and original publication; and not merely the *illustrating*, or giving new splendor to a doctrine, by the addition of one, or more circumstances, unknown before.

Hence we learn, and indeed from what we are told, that the *Jews*, before the coming of our Saviour, sat in *darkness*, and in the *region and shadow of death*. A very odd character and description of a People, who were perfectly acquainted with the great truths and principles of the Gospel; and consequently surrounded with the light, which shines forth in the New Testament.

However, the eminent writer before-mentioned assures us; that *Jesus* did NOT give "the first and only notice of this doctrine". All that I need remark upon it, is; that this assurance seems directly to contradict the word of inspiration †. For if "the great Sal-

\* Sermons, vol. i. p. 189.

† *Suidas* and *Stephens* both explain it in this sense. Φωτίζειν· αὐτῶν εἰς φῶς ἀγεῖν, ἀναγέλλειν· οἱ δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι νομισάντες ἤδη τὸν καὶρὸν παρεχόμενοι Φωτίζειν τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀποφθεῖλον. (*Suidas*.)

Accusativo. Illuminare, illustrare. Item in lucem ducere, producere, proferre. Enuntiare. Detegere. Declarare, ut, Romani autem existimarunt jam ipsum tempus sibi permittere in lucem proferre, & declarare illud arcanum, quod ipsis mandatum fuerat.

If then the word signifies in *lucem producere, proferre*; --- enuntiare, detegere, declarare arcanum; it may very properly be translated "revelation".

“ vation of the Gospel *first* began to be spoken  
 “ by the Lord,” the *first* and *original* notice  
 of it must have been derived from him.

To proceed. St. Paul observes, that *Jesus Christ* “ was sent to shew *light* unto the peo-  
 “ ple (*i. e.* the *Jews*) and to the Gentiles ”. It is plain from hence, that he was a *light* to the *first*; in the same sense in which he was a *light* to the last: and therefore, as he was a *light* to the Gentiles by revealing the mystery  
 perly denote the discovery of any *secret* purpose and design, which God had not hitherto revealed. Dr. Warburton seems to have understood the word in this sense, when, to confirm his interpretation of the present text, he adds,  
 “ And for this reason we find that *life and immortality*,  
 “ which is here said to be *brought to light through the Gos-*  
 “ *pel*, is so often called *The mystery of the Gospel*: that is  
 “ *a mystery*, till this promulgation of it by the Disciples  
 “ of Christ. The term was borrowed from those famous  
 “ *rites of Paganism* so named, and applied with admirable  
 “ *justness*. For as the *mysteries* were communicated only  
 “ to a few of the wise and great, and kept hid from the  
 “ populace; so *life and immortality*, as we shall see, was  
 “ revealed by God, as a special favour, to the holy Pa-  
 “ triarchs and Prophets, but kept hid from the body of  
 “ the *Jewish nation*.”

*Erasmus* seems plainly to have understood it in this sense, *Destruxit quidem mortem, illuminavit autem vitam. Καταργήσας, i. e. qui abolevit & obliteravit: φωτίζων, i. e. in lucem produxit. Nam hæc duo inter se composuit veluti pugnantia. Mors regnabat; ei regnum abrogatum est. Latebat vita; ea per Christum emicuit.* And, which is still more to the purpose, my Lord Bishop of *London* himself, both in his third sermon, and in his discourses on prophecy, gives it no other,

“ *Acts* xxvi, 23.



of redemption, in a restoration to *life and immortality*, to them absolutely unknown; it seems to follow, that he also enlightened the *Jews* by the manifestation of a truth equally unknown.

If he came “to shew *light* to the *Jews*,” could they be in any other state than that of *blindness and darkness*?

To know in what *extent* he was a light to the *Jews*, we should consider the state and condition they were in before the preaching the Gospel; as we find it described by the inspired writers. “The people which sat in “*darkness* saw great light: and to them which “sat in the *region and shadow of death*, light “is sprung up<sup>h</sup>.”

Agreeably to this account of things *Zacharias*, in his prophecy upon the birth of the Baptist, says, “The *Day-spring* from on “high hath visited us;”

“To give light to them that sit in *darkness*, “and in the *shadow of death*; to guide our feet “into the way of peace<sup>i</sup>.” A description, which will by no means permit us to suppose that they were enlightened with a *good proof* of redemption or a *future state*<sup>k</sup>; and only denied the knowledge of the resurrection.

<sup>h</sup> *Matth.* iv. 16. <sup>i</sup> *Luke* i. 78, 79.

<sup>k</sup> *Bishop of London's sermons*, vol. i. sermon 6.

If they had been enlightened with such a proof, they would have been in the region of life and immortality; and not in the verge and shadow of death. They would not have been sitting in darkness, but walking in the light, if they actually saw the grand object in question, or the restoration to life and immortality.

This life and immortality was the object to be illuminated by Jesus Christ. But if it was visible and conspicuous before, how could the people be said to sit in darkness? If it was not visible and conspicuous before, how could they be said to have a good proof of a future state, or a good view of the object in question?

How consistent it is to assign a good view of an object to a people sitting in darkness, must be left to the judgment of others. However, this seems to be the necessary consequence of affirming that the Jews had a good proof of a future life.

“St. Peter, says his Lordship, in his first Epistle tells all christians, that they are called out of darkness into God’s marvellous light.--- Ask the Evangelists, they will tell you; The day-spring from on high hath visited us, to give light to them that sit in darkness, and in the shadow of death. Ask any, or all of the Apostles; they will tell you, their com-  
mission



"mission is, *to open the eyes of the people, and to turn them from darkness to light.*"

But, how could the Jewish people have a good view or prospect of life and immortality, if their eyes were not opened? How could they be called out of darkness, if their former situation presented them with a good view of an object which they were now first invited to behold? And how could they sit in the shadow of death, if they had been favoured with a good proof of a future life? If the Law had afforded such a proof, that proof must in great measure have scattered and dispelled the darkness in which they were involved; and have rescued and delivered them out of the region and shadow of death.

If we would know, I say, in what measure and extent Jesus Christ was a light to the Jews, we must consider their state and condition before they were enlightened by him. Now the inspired writers tell us that they were covered with the thickest darkness, in which they wandered, like men, whose eyes are not opened? And how was it possible to enlighten men thus situated, but by bringing objects to light in the strict and proper sense of the words, or by rendering things visible which before were invisible? It would be ridiculous

- Discourses on Prophecy, p. 7, 8. 4th Ed.

mission

to

to say that they *sat in darkness*, or that they *had not their eyes opened*, merely because they did not see the object in its *full proportion and extent*, or had not an *exact* view of every distinct and minute part, and the opportunity of examining and surveying it quite round.

The *sitting in darkness*, and *in the region and shadow of death*, evidently implies, therefore, a *total* absence and want of light, or a perfect and entire ignorance of the doctrines by which the people thus circumstanced were to be enlightened: it being impossible to express the most absolute and entire ignorance in more significant and emphatic terms. [16]

Let us now return again to the text, which informs us, "that *Jesus Christ brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel*." It is evident that the word *φως* here, alludes to the character and description of our Saviour elsewhere, in which he is said to be *the light of the world*, and *the light which lighteneth every man*<sup>m</sup>. The term, when predicated of *Jesus Christ*, is sometimes applied to *persons*, and sometimes to *things*. When applied to *persons*, it signifies giving light to those who were in darkness; when to *things*, the *illuminating what lay hid*; consequently it sup-

<sup>m</sup> John i. 9. poses



poses that the doctrines, with which men were enlightened, had hitherto lain in obscurity. If you ask how, or in what manner, he enlightened men, my Lord Bishop will tell you, it was by opening the eyes of those *who could not see before*. As his enlightening the *Jews* is compared to the sun shining upon a dark and benighted world; for he is represented as the source and fountain of light, not only enabling men to see clearly and distinctly, but enabling them to see *at all*.

The *sitting in darkness*, and the *not having their eyes opened*, are metaphorical expressions, which, if they have any meaning, must imply an absolute ignorance.

There is indeed a necessity for supposing, that both the *person* and the *object* received the *light* in the very same proportion and extent, since the *blindness* ascribed to the one must exactly correspond to the *darkness* and *obscurity* of the other.

In the text, which speaks of bringing life and immortality to *light*, the word is applied to the *object*. Now, if when applied to the *person*, it signifies, as it needs must, the presenting an object to view which before was not distinguished, does it become distinguishable as soon as ever the word is applied to the *thing*?

It

It can indeed signify nothing in *this place*, but making an object distinguishable, which before was unperceived; for how did Jesus Christ enlighten the doctrine of life and immortality, but by making it visible in the regions and the shadow of death, where it had hitherto been invisible? His Lordship seems to think, it makes for his purpose to observe, that the word signifies to *illuminate* and *enlighten*. But he then should consider, that it must needs imply *such a degree* of illumination as would make an object visible, which before was invisible.

The word *φωτισω* therefore, when applied to the doctrine of life and immortality, will force us to conclude, if we will have any regard to the integrity and uniformity of the metaphor, that this doctrine had till then been absolutely unknown. However, his Lordship will have it, that the word imports only such an accession and increase of light, as would afford a perfect and exact view of objects, which were in a good measure discerned before, though not thoroughly, nor, in every distinct and minute part. <sup>a</sup> *distinctly*. But then, the *Jews* could never be said to sit *in darkness*, if they had a good general view of the object; nor could their eyes want open-

<sup>a</sup> Sermons, vol. i. p. 189, 190, 191. Sermon 6th.



ing, nor could they be described as *blind*, if they in a good measure saw already what they were afterwards enabled to discern only more accurately.

St. Paul says, that Jesus Christ *opened* their eyes; his Lordship, that Jesus only cured some defects in their sight, which was very good, though not eagle-eyed, before. In excess of charity, he calls that a *mote* which the Apostle calls a *beam*. Old *Zacharias* affirms, that the day-spring gave light to men in darkness; his Lordship, that the days of thick darkness were past, and that nothing more than some thin clouds remained, to be dissipated and dispelled by this sun of Righteousness.

But as his Lordship contends that "the word *φωτισμός* can only signify *enlightening*" and *illustrating* such doctrines as had not been "perfectly revealed," ° we must inquire what were the particular *defects* and *imperfections*, which attended the revelation of a future state, under the law. Now these, we are told, were, that it exhibited only a *shadow*, and not a *perfect image*, of the good things brought to light by the Gospel. These good things, it did not reveal in plain and express terms, but under the *veil* and *cover* of such blessings

° Sermons, vol. i. p. 189.

as were purely temporal. Which at best could be considered only as a faint and imperfect delineation, a mere shadow and outline of blessings spiritual and future. Now, this faint delineation and mere shadow, was what Jesus Christ was (*φανίζον*) to *illustrate* and *enlighten*, to embody and fill up. When he had done this, he might be properly said, to *bring to light*, what till then had lain hid. For what could the people know of the nature and properties of that thing, of which they had seen nothing more than a shadow, or a few faint out-lines?

His Lordship insists much that the word signifies only to *illustrate*, *enlighten*, and *make plain*. But what was this which was to be *illustrated*, &c.? Nothing substantial, nothing embodied; but a mere shadow, a few faint outlines only. The word therefore must at least import such a *degree* of illumination, or such an accession and increase of light, as was sufficient to bring out an object into open day, which before lay hid in obscurity, and was but just distinguishable from *nothing*.

He seems to rest much on this distinction, that the word cannot signify to bring a thing into *being* and *existence*, but only to illustrate and enlighten something which had a being  
and



and existence before.<sup>p</sup> But the distinction, though well grounded, is of no manner of service to his argument, since those he reasons against, are agreed with him, that this light illustrated what was already in being, namely, the typical representations of a future state in the Law.

The only point in dispute is concerning the degree of darkness and obscurity which encompassed these typical representations, and which was scattered and dispelled by the Gospel light. We are to inquire then whether the doctrine so enveloped was obvious and visible to the body of the Jews. Now his Lordship himself asserts, that they were intended for a veil or cover<sup>q</sup>; and therefore he must own that they would not have answered the end proposed, unless they had kept the doctrine out of sight, and hid from the notice of the people. If then Jesus Christ took off, and entirely removed this veil or cover, and openly and nakedly held up to sight the doctrine which had been concealed under it, we may strictly and properly say, that

<sup>p</sup> P. 189.

<sup>q</sup> In his discourses on Prophecy, p. 34. he observes, that "figurative language was intended for a veil or cover." And he will allow that the typical descriptions were highly figurative.

life and immortality was brought to light by him.

His Lordship tells us, that the doctrine of a future state was involved in *doubts* and *uncertainties* under the Law, which were cleared up by the knowledge of the resurrection, revealed in the Gospel. Here I would desire to know, Whether the *Jews* had such quick and piercing apprehensions as to penetrate through the carnal veil or cover of these types and figures, and to discern the spiritual doctrine of a future state, which lay hid beneath? If they were not able to do this, then they could have no good proof of a future life, so industriously placed out of their sight, and secreted from them. If they saw into the spiritual sense, they could have no *doubts* and *uncertainties*: If they saw not into the spiritual sense, they could have no good proof.

Take it which way you will, his Lordship's hypothesis will not hold water: whether you allow, or whether you deny them the spiritual sense, the whole doctrine contained in this hypothesis slips away from us. On the first supposition the *Jews* must have seen the whole power and substance of the Gospel in the Law, and then, contrary to the hypothesis, they must have been as well ac-

P. 191.

C

quainted



quainted with the doctrine of the resurrection, as with the doctrine of a future state. On the other supposition, they could have had no better proof of a future state than of a resurrection ; which is still as contrary to the hypothesis. In a word, as the two doctrines were exhibited together under types, or transmitted under the same common medium of conveyance, we must suppose that they were either both discovered, or both secreted, during the period in question.

Whatever the advocates of the common system may happen to think, or may venture to talk of the great truths and principles of the Gospel being opened and revealed to the *Jewish Church*, St. Paul declares, that they were kept secret in the age of the law. " We speak the wisdom of God *in a mystery*, even *the hidden wisdom*, which God ordained before the world unto our glory :." Here the Apostle represents the scheme of our salvation, or the good tidings of the Gospel, as the wisdom of God *in a mystery*, or as *the hidden wisdom* of God, purposed indeed before the foundation of the world, but not manifested and discovered till the age of the Gospel. Again,

" Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of *the mysteries* of God :."

\* 1 Cor. ii. 7.    \* 1 Cor. iv. 1.

What

What are these *Mysteries*, of which he calls himself the *Steward*, but the scheme of salvation delivered in the Gospel, the doctrines of a resurrection, and a future state? In his second epistle, asserting the peculiar dignity and excellence of his office, he makes it to consist in his being appointed minister of the *spirit* of the law, and not of the *letter*<sup>2</sup>; and, in his being intrusted with the word or ministry of *reconciliation*<sup>3</sup>. So then, the *spiritual sense* of the Law, and the *word of reconciliation*, were those Gospel-mysteries of which he was appointed *steward* and dispenser. But, if the *spiritual sense* of the Law was a *mystery*, the doctrine of a future state, which was so eminent and considerable a part of this sense, must have been a mystery likewise. The word or doctrine of *reconciliation* was God's intention to pardon, and restore mankind to eternal life. And this intention, according to St. Paul, continued a mystery, till it was revealed in the Gospel.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. iii. 6, &c. "Who hath made us ministers of the New Testament, not of the *letter*, but the *spirit*; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

<sup>3</sup> 2 Cor. v. 18. "And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation."



The Apostle, speaking of the particular doctrine entrusted to his ministry, calls it *The mystery of the Gospel, The word of reconciliation, and The promise of eternal life*<sup>1</sup>. Thus it appears that the mystery of the Gospel, and the promise of eternal life, are one and the same thing.

The passage in the epistle to the *Corinthians* will throw much light on that in the Epistle to *Timothy*. To the *Corinthians* he says, "We speak the wisdom" of God in a "mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God "ordained before the world unto our glory"<sup>2</sup>. To *Timothy* he says, "God hath saved us according to his own purpose and his grace, "which was given us in Christ Jesus before "the world began.

"But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who "hath brought life and immortality to light "through the Gospel".

It is evident, that the *grace* and *purpose*, i. e. the gracious purpose, which God had decreed to give us "before the world began," must be the same with "the hidden wisdom which he ordained before the world "unto our glory." For what did he ordain before the world unto our glory, but *this gra-*

<sup>1</sup> *Titus* i. 1, 2, 3.    <sup>2</sup> *1 Cor.* ii. 7.    <sup>3</sup> *2 Tim.* i. 9, 10.

cious purpose of saving mankind by Christ Jesus?

Thus the bringing life and immortality to light, was the manifestation or revelation of the mystery, which God had ordained before the world unto our glory.

How warmly soever his Lordship may oppose this interpretation in his *sixth* sermon, he seems to have thought more favourably of it in his *third*. "If you look (says he) into the sacred writers, you will find, that *the whole design* of the Gospel, the dispensation of Providence in the salvation of mankind, is styled a mystery; *the hidden wisdom of God, which was kept secret since the world began*: a mystery 'tis called, because it was kept secret since the world began, God not having opened or declared his gracious purposes before the coming of Christ. With respect to this time of *secrecy and silence* the Gospel is called *a mystery*; but, upon the revelation of it by Christ Jesus, it is no longer looked upon as *a mystery*, but as the manifestation of God's will and goodness to man. Thus you will find St. Paul speaking in the last of the *Romans*, *The mystery which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the*

1 Cor. xi. 7.



“ prophets, according to the commandment of  
 “ everlasting God, made known to all nations  
 “ for the obedience of faith : that is, this great  
 “ work was a mystery in all ages, being kept  
 “ secret in the counsels of God ; but, since  
 “ the coming of Christ, ’tis no longer a my-  
 “ stery, but is manifest and made known to  
 “ all nations and people <sup>d</sup>.” And again,

“ As the Gospel itself is in this sense styled  
 “ a mystery, so are the several parts of it like-  
 “ wise. In this sense the Gospel is full of  
 “ mysteries, as containing the secret purposes  
 “ of God’s *hidden* wisdom in the redemption  
 “ of the world, which were made manifest by  
 “ Christ Jesus, who brought life and immorta-  
 “ lity to light <sup>e</sup>.” [A<sup>ms</sup>]

When I first read these passages, I flattered myself that his Lordship was endeavouring to establish the doctrine of the *Divine Legation*. The presumption seemed to be well-grounded, as the expression of *bringing life and immortality to light* is here interpreted in the very same sense Dr. Warburton understands it ; and the word *φωτίζω* is made to signify the opening and unfolding of a mystery, which was totally unknown before. I was confirmed in this opinion, upon recollecting that his Lordship has

“ P. 132, 133, vol. i. “ P. 135.

asserted

asserted the same exposition of this text in his *Discourses on prophecy*; where he tells us, “ that  
 “ God, after the flood, said nothing to the  
 “ remnant of mankind of the *punishments* and  
 “ *rewards* of another life, because they were  
 “ *reserved* to be *revealed* by him, whose pro-  
 “ vince it was to *bring life and immortality to*  
 “ *light* through the Gospel.”

His Lordship does not here say, that *the resurrection*, but even that the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, was *reserved* to be *revealed* by Jesus Christ, who *brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel*.

It is not said, that Jesus was merely to *illustrate, enlighten, and clear up* the doctrine of a future life, but that he was to give the *first notice* of it. For he affirms, that the punishments and rewards of another state could not have been taught and inculcated before, without anticipating the office and intrenching upon the province of our blessed Saviour.

The passages here quoted both from his *Sermons* and his *Discourses*, plainly declare that *the work* of redemption *itself*, and not that *the time* when, or *the person* by whom it was to be effected, was all along a *mystery*, or a thing kept secret in the counsels of God.

P. 100.

C 4

Thus



Thus his Lordship supposes that the Redeemer and his work were coeval, and went hand-in-hand; for he tells us, that the redemption and restoration of mankind were to continue a secret and a mystery till the appearing of our Saviour.

When his Lordship considers the passages of the New Testament, which mention *the mystery of the Gospel*, he finds himself obliged to acknowledge that the great points of Christianity were kept secret till the coming of Christ. But when he afterwards addresses himself to defend the common system, or to attack that of the *D. L.* he then finds himself obliged to abandon the scripture doctrine, even as it had been interpreted by himself.

Thus he directly opposes Dr. Warburton's interpretation in his *sixth* sermon, tho' he as directly asserts it in his *third*, and in his *Discourses on Prophecy*. I shall leave it to others to balance and determine the moment of his arguments alledged on *either side*, and proceed to offer some observations on this *mystery of the Gospel*.

Some of the writers against the *D. L.* would limit and restrain it to *the calling of the Gentiles to be partakers of God's promises in Christ*. But I have the pleasure to find, that this di-

*Rutherford's essay on virtue, p. 383.*

inction

inction is rejected by his Lordship, who concurs with the author of the *Divine Legation*, Dr. Clarke<sup>p</sup>, and Dr. Middleton<sup>i</sup>, in extending it to the *whole* scheme and system of the Gospel. Many considerations might be alledged in support of this exposition, which I shall omit at present, as I have no occasion to enter into the controversy. For if St. Paul styles *the whole* Gospel, or the scheme of our salvation by Jesus Christ, a *mystery*, what will it signify or avail to prove, that he styles the calling of the Gentiles a *mystery* too? Must not the *part* necessarily come under the same predicament with the *whole*? If the *whole* was a *mystery*, must not the several *parts* be so likewise?

The calling of the Gentiles must either have been styled a *mystery*, as being an eminent and considerable branch of the *grand mystery* of the Gospel, or it must be styled so, in opposition and contra-distinction to the calling of the *Jews*, which was no *mystery*. The first sense confirms the argument of the D. L. And of the second, we need only observe, that it makes St. Paul inconsistent with himself, since he declares in other places, accord-

<sup>p</sup> Sermons, and Paraphrase on the Gospels.

<sup>i</sup> Answer to Dr. Dodwell and Dr. Church, p. 46. Letter from Rome, Preface, p. 85, 86. Examination of the Bishop of London's discourses on Prophecy, p. 93, 94.



ing to my Lord Bishop's own interpretation, that the salvation of mankind in general, (of the *Jews* as well as *Gentiles*) "was the *hidden wisdom of God, or the wisdom of God in a mystery* <sup>1</sup>."

In a word, it will be to no purpose to pretend, that that part of the Gospel relating to the *Gentiles* is styled *a mystery*, unless you can prove that it is styled so, in opposition and contra-distinction to the other part of the Gospel relating to the *Jews*. And this you never can prove, while *St. Paul* is allowed to be consistent with himself, or indeed to say what he has said, and which my Lord Bishop has ventured to say after him, where he observes, that "the *Gospel itself* is styled *a mystery*, and "the *several parts* of it likewise <sup>1</sup>."

If therefore the writers against the *D. L.* could prove, that the calling of the *Gentiles* is sometimes styled *a mystery*, they would still have the mortification to find that their pains and labour have been employed to no purpose. But the disappointment would be still greater, if it should appear that this very circumstance, which they so sedulously labour to prove, is destructive of their own system. It may therefore be proper to add, that they are involved in a train of the most glaring and bare-

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 7. iv. 1. <sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 133.

faced contradictions, and all along argue at the expence of their own hypothesis, while they endeavour to limit and confine *the mystery of the Gospel* to the calling of the Gentiles only. For, according to their interpretation of the ancient prophecies, the calling of the *Gentiles* could be no more a mystery than the calling of the *Jews*.

In their exposition of the first and original prophecy, which declares, *that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head*; they tell us that the promise of redemption, or a restoration to life and immortality, was revealed to *Adam* and *Eve*, and was extended to all their posterity without any distinction or reserve. They tell us, too, that the same promise was afterwards repeated to *Noah*; and to *Abraham*, when he was told, "that all the nations of the earth were to be blessed in one of his seed." They pretend likewise, that the famous text in the xix<sup>th</sup> chapter of the book of *Job*, was a plain prophetic description of the grand article of the Gospel; or a clear and incontestable proof that *Job*, who as an Alien from the commonwealth of *Israel*, and no descendant of *Abraham* by the seed of *Isaac*, had the promise of being admitted to all the benefits of the christian covenant. And how can they pretend, after this, that the calling of the *Gentiles* to be partakers of this covenant,



covenant, was a *mystery*, which had been kept secret and hidden from the beginning of the world?

If then we should agree to limit this mystery to the calling of the Gentiles, we shall still make strange havoc and confusion in the common system, as it's advocates will be obliged to give up the three prophecies above-mentioned, which have ever been considered as the grand *palladium* of their cause.

St. Paul tells the Gentiles, that their salvation had been promised *before* the law. If we ask, where we are to look for such a promise, we are referred to the prophecies which declare that the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head; and that all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in one of the descendants of *Abraham*. And if we should again ask, how the salvation of the Gentiles could be a mystery, *if it was foretold in these prophecies*; must not the patrons of the common system say, that the ancient Jews did not see into the *spiritual* sense of these prophecies, or their relation to a future state?

Dr. Rutherford has employed much pains to prove, that the promise of the redemption of *all* mankind by the Son of God was revealed to the Patriarchs, and made the princi-

— Essay on Virtue, c. 11.

pal

pal basis and foundation of the Religion of those times <sup>m</sup>. However, he maintains likewise, that "*the mystery of the Gospel* does not mean the knowledge " of a future life then first " communicated to mankind, but *the calling* " of the Gentiles in particular, to be partakers of God's promises in Christ <sup>n</sup>."

Now let me ask, if the calling of *all* the nations of the world *in general* had been so clearly revealed to the Patriarchs, how could the calling of the *Gentiles in particular* be deemed a *mystery*?

If he will bestow upon the body of the faithful in the patriarchal ages, the knowledge of the redemption of mankind, he must mean *all* mankind, or he quibbles and prevaricates: And then what becomes of the mystery of the Gospel mentioned by St. Paul?

It has been said, the admission of the Gentiles into the christian church, *without conforming to the law of Moses*, was *this mystery*. But this refinement, as refinements often do, leaves all sense and meaning behind it. For the salvation of *all* mankind was promised and revealed many ages before the institution of the Law, if it was, as these men say, promised and revealed in the prophecies above-mentioned. And in these ages the distinction

<sup>n</sup> *Ib.* p. 383.

between



between *Jew* and *Gentile* was not in being: or rather the objects of that distinction did not yet exist. It was therefore impossible that a promise, made to be understood by those to whom it was given, should have any reference or allusion to *People* not yet existing, or to a *Law* not yet in being, and which was at last only thrust in by way of *interim*, or *added because of transgressions till the seed should come*°. If therefore the faithful, who lived when these Prophecies were given, had a revelation of the salvation of *all* mankind, antecedently to, and independently of, the *Law*; they must necessarily have had a revelation of the grand *mystery*, which, according to St. *Paul*, was reserved for the Gospel.

My Lord Bishop affirms, that the *Jews* had *frequent* and *early* notice, that the *Law* was to cease, and be repealed, after the introduction of the new covenant<sup>p</sup>. How then could the admission of the *Gentiles*, without any previous subjection to the *Law*, be styled a *mystery*, if both this admission, and the cessation of the *Law*, had been plainly revealed in the Old Testament?

Thus his Lordship leaves no *mystery* at all, concerning the calling of the *Gentiles*, for the Gospel to disclose; it having been before

° *Gal.* iii. 19. <sup>p</sup> Discourses on Prophecy, p. 163, &c.  
revealed,

revealed, not only that the Gentiles were to be partakers of the new covenant, but that they were to be partakers of it without any previous conformity and submission to the Law.

If the doctrine of redemption and a future state was the foundation of the patriarchal Religion, the patriarchal and christian Covenant must have been one and the same. Consequently the doctrine of *universal* redemption, or the redemption of *all* mankind on the very *same terms and conditions*, was so far from being a *mystery* or secret reserved to be revealed by the religion of Jesus, that it was the fundamental article of the religion of the Patriarchs.

The faithful of those early times having no notion of the distinction between the *Jews* and the *Gentiles*, must have seen *all* mankind, without exception, invited to partake of the benefits of this Redemption upon the very same terms and conditions with themselves. Therefore neither the calling of *any part* of mankind to the Gospel, nor the terms and conditions on which they were to be called, could be a *mystery* in this age and season of the world.

You will say, perhaps, that the calling of the Gentiles commenced a *mystery* after the giving of the Law. If you do, you will say nothing to the purpose : for St. Paul is here speaking



speaking of a doctrine, which he represents as having been a mystery *from the beginning of the world*, or in the ages preceding the Law, before the distinction between Jew and Gentile was in being. In this sense my Lord Bishop interprets St. Paul, <sup>a</sup> and interprets him very rightly, as appears from some parallel places.

But further; on the principles of the common system, it could be no more a *mystery*, after the law was given, and this distinction took place, than it had been, before. For if the promise of a prophet, like to Moses, was given to inform and assure the Jews, that their law was to be antiquated and set aside, or if its period and dissolution was foretold at the very time of its institution; here would have been a plain prophecy, that the Gentiles were to have the offer of the Gospel on the same terms with the Jews.

The Jews were either taught to consider the Law as a perfect Religion, and consequently a *whole* and entire dispensation; or as only the *introduction* to one more excellent. On the first supposition they could have *no* revelation of a future state, since it seems to be agreed on all hands, that the Law continued

<sup>a</sup> Sermon 3d, vol. i. p. 132, 133.

<sup>b</sup> Discourses on Prophecy, 163, 164, &c.

no promises or threatnings but what were temporal.

If they had the idea of no Religion besides the law, they could not have the doctrine of a future state. If they had the idea of another system, then the calling of the Gentiles could be a *mystery* in no sense at all, as the Jews must have known that the Law was only intended to be subservient to the introduction of a new and better Covenant.

And here let the patrons of the common system tell us, whether the typical sense of the Law was opened to, or concealed from, the *Jewish* church. If it was concealed, the doctrine of life and immortality must have been a secret, while this sense remained under a veil or cover. If it was opened, the temporary and preparatory nature of the Law must have been opened too; and consequently its cessation, and the exemption of the Gentiles from its rites and ceremonies, could not have been a *mystery*. We must therefore either suppose with the author of the *D. L.* that the doctrine of life and immortality *was a mystery*, or suppose that the calling of the Gentiles *was no mystery*, in direct contradiction to St. Paul.

The promise of life and immortality, attached to the new Covenant, was evidently unfit for the knowledge of the ancient Jews.

D

For



For it would have taught them that their Religion was only a meagre *element*, or shadowy *type* of a more perfect and excellent Institution; and that between the letter of the Law and the spirit of the Gospel there was an irreconcilable difference. All this, attended with the knowledge that the Gentiles were to be admitted by a new and better Covenant into the number of God's people on the same footing with themselves, without going through the purgatory of the Law, would have so enflamed their prejudices against it, as to make the intermediate subjection to it a thing impossible.

However, Mr. Locke often declares, that the *mystery* mentioned by St. Paul means the exemption of the Gentiles from the rites and ceremonies of the Law, or their admission to the new covenant, without becoming proselytes to Judaism\*.

Now if this exemption of the Gentiles, and the cessation of the Law, were a *mystery*, they could only be so, because the *spiritual* nature of the Gospel, or its promise of life and immortality, was not yet revealed. For had the Jews been apprized that the Law was only intended to be a *preparatory* system, or subservient to the *introduction* of a more excellent

\* See his notes on St. Paul's Epistles.

and perfect mode of worship, of which it had been typical and figurative, neither the cessation, nor exemption above-mentioned, could have been a *mystery* among them.

We cannot therefore suppose, that these things were a *mystery*, if we transfer the revelation of a future state, the essential article of the Gospel, to the ages before, and under the Law.

Let us next consider in what manner the calling of the Gentiles is set forth and described by the ancient prophets. "In that  
" day shall there be an ALTAR to the Lord  
" in the midst of the land of *Egypt*, and a  
" PILLAR at the border thereof unto the Lord.

" And the Lord shall be known to *Egypt*,  
" and the *Egyptians* shall know the Lord in  
" that day, and shall do SACRIFICE and  
" OBLATION, yea they shall vow a vow unto  
" the Lord, and shall perform it :."

" Also the sons of the stranger, even them  
" will I bring to my HOLY MOUNTAIN, and  
" make them joyful in MY HOUSE OF PRAYER,  
" their BURNT OFFERINGS shall be accepted  
" upon MINE ALTAR, for MINE HOUSE shall  
" be called a house of prayer to all people :."

The *calling* of the Gentiles could be no more a *mystery* than the calling of the Jews,

\* *Isaiah* xix. 19, 20, 21. \* *Ibid.* lvi. 7.



since the one was as plainly foretold as the other; or the Gentiles were represented as being partakers of the same covenant with the Jews, and as standing in the same relation to the one true God after their conversion. For they are described as performing the same *sacrifices, oblations, and religious services*, in the same tabernacle or house of God \*.

The only circumstance therefore in this *calling of the Gentiles*, which was *mysterious* or hidden in these prophecies, was the spiritual nature and genius of the new covenant, into which they were to be admitted. And this seems to have been delivered *mysteriously* enough, since the *new covenant* is described under such terms and images as were proper and peculiar to the *old*; or is represented as consisting of those rites, ceremonies, observances, and places of worship prescribed by the Law.

Let me ask, then, whether the spiritual sense of these prophecies was secreted from, or revealed to, the ancient Jews. If it was secreted, the *calling* of the Jews to the life

\* Here then is another proof, that the calling of the Gentiles could not be considered by St. Paul as a *mystery* in opposition to the calling of the Jews. For there could be no room to suppose any such opposition, since the first are represented as joining in the same common worship with the last under the new dispensation.

and immortality offered in the Gospel, must have been as much a *mystery*, as the *calling* of the Gentiles to that blessing. If the spiritual sense was revealed, the calling of the Gentiles to the religion of Jesus, without a previous submission to the Law, could have been no more a *mystery* than the calling of the Jews to the religion of Moses.

It may be said, that the prophecies which foretel that *all* nations should come and worship at Jerusalem, were a sufficient declaration that a *spiritual* religion was to take place under the *Messiah*, and to succeed the rites and ceremonies of the Law which were then to be repealed. But if so, what becomes of the *mystery* in question ?

Dr. Warburton had said, the life and immortality revealed by *Jesus Christ*, was the *mystery of the Gospel* mentioned by St. Paul. A late writer would explain this mystery in another manner, " That multitudes of Gentiles " should one day forsake idolatry, and be converted to " the worship of God ; this could scarcely be unknown, " after the prophets had said so much about it ; but that " the Gentiles should become God's people without being " made proselytes to Judaism, and that the ceremonial " law should be antiquated, this was not so clearly declared as to be understood before the event explained " it." Mr. Fortin's Discourses on the Christian Religion, p. 98.

It is strange this learned person should affect to differ from Dr. Warburton in his account of this mystery, since he supposes with him that the promise of life and immortality was not revealed in the writings of *Moses* and the



Mr. *Locke* observes, that the *mystery* of the Gospel was contained in the obscure prophecies of the Old Testament, which hid and concealed it from the knowledge of the ancient *Jews* <sup>2</sup>.

It will follow, that this *mystery* extended to the calling of the *Jews* as well as the *Gentiles*; since the one was the subject of these prophecies as well as the other.

The blessing of the Gospel, which was contained in mysterious and obscure prophecies. For why was it not revealed at that time, but because it was a *mystery*, the opening and unfolding of which was reserved for the age of the Gospel?

He must have recourse to the doctrine of the *D. L.* even to prove that the cessation of the Law, or the admission of the Gentiles, without conforming to it, was a *mystery*. For neither of these things could be a *mystery* any longer than while the spiritual nature and genius of the Gospel, or its promise of life and immortality, remained unknown.

How could the cessation of the Law, or the admission of the Gentiles into the christian church without becoming proselytes to Judaism, have been a *mystery* in the patriarchal ages, before either the Law, or the distinction between *Jew* and *Gentile* had been heard of?

St. *Paul* represents this *mystery* as the *great thing* which God had predestinated in *Christ Jesus* before the beginning of the world <sup>\*</sup>. And will the learned person say, that the cessation of the Law, or the admission of the Gentiles into the new covenant, without conforming to it, was the *grand thing* predestinated by God in *Christ Jesus* before the beginning of the world? Or is it not evident, that this could be nothing but the restoration of mankind to life and immortality, forfeited by the fall?

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 7.

\* Ephes. iii. 9.

aises *under* the law, was also contained in mysterious and obscure prophecies, which were given *before* the law. It was therefore as properly a *mystery* before, as after the creation of the Jewish polity. [p. 166.]

Proceed we now to other testimonies. St. *John*, speaking of the different doctrines of the Jewish and Christian dispensations, says, "The *Law* was given by *Moses*, but *Grace* and *Truth* came by *Jesus Christ*." If *Moses* taught the doctrine of Redemption in common with *Jesus*, *Truth* and *Grace* must have been given by *Moses*, together with the *Law*. For the doctrine of Redemption contains that *Grace* and *Truth* revealed in the Gospel.

"Sin, says St. Paul, shall not have dominion over you: For ye are not *under the Law*, but *under grace*." These last words shew that the *Jews* were not under *grace*, i. e. not under the merciful dispensation of the Gospel, and under the rigour of the *Law* both together. Tho' the common system, by giving the *Jews* the doctrine of a future State, puts them *under the Law* and *under Grace* at the same time, how contrary soever it be to this declaration of St. Paul.

"But now the righteousness of God, says

<sup>b</sup> *John* i. 17.

<sup>c</sup> *Romans* iii. 21, 22.



“ the Apostle, without the Law is *manifested*,  
 “ being witnessed by Moses and the Prophets.”

“ Even the righteousness of God which is  
 “ by faith of Jesus Christ <sup>d</sup>.”

How could St. Paul say the righteousness of God without the law was now only *manifested*, and brought to light, if it had been revealed both before and under the Law?

He says, it was now *manifested*, and yet it had been attested by *Moses* and the Prophets, How are we to reconcile this, but by supposing, that tho' it had been delivered in so faint and obscure a manner, as to have escaped the notice of those to whom the prophecies were immediately addressed, yet the intimations were precise enough to prove (after the mystery was revealed) that Moses and the prophets referred to the *new Dispensation*, and bore witness to the truth of it?

In another place St. Paul assures us, that the doctrine of salvation by *faith in Christ* was not published under the Law. “ But before  
 “ Faith came, we were kept under the Law,  
 “ shut up unto the Faith, which should  
 “ *afterwards* be revealed <sup>e</sup>.” The *Jews* are here represented as pent and shut up in prison, or confined to a place of obscurity and darkness, before faith came, *i. e.* the promise of

<sup>d</sup> *Romans* vi. 14.

<sup>e</sup> *Gal.* iii. 23.

salvation by faith in Christ<sup>1</sup>. For the Apostle tells us, that this was *reserved to be revealed afterwards*.

If my Lord Bishop will still affirm, that “the Law afforded a good proof of a future life,” let him tell us, whether it was promised to *faith in Christ*, or to the *works of the Law*. To say the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ was revealed so early, would evidently contradict the three passages of St. Paul just recited. To say *future rewards* were attached to the observance of the Law, would as evidently contradict one of the leading principles in *the Discourses on prophecy*, which asserts that the sanctions of the Law were purely temporal.

But to proceed. “Who hath also (saith St. Paul) made us able ministers of the new Testament, not of the letter, but of the spirit: For the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.

“But if the ministration of death written and engraven on stones was glorious, so

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Locke paraphrases this text in the following manner: “But before Christ and the doctrine of justification by faith in him came, we *Jews* were shut up as a company of prisoners together, under the custody and inflexible rigour of the Law, unto the coming of the Messiah, when the doctrine of justification by faith in him should be revealed.”

“that



“ that the children of *Israel* could not steadfast-  
 “ ly behold the face of *Moses*, for the glory  
 “ of his countenance, which glory was to be  
 “ done away ;

“ How shall not the ministration of the  
 “ spirit be rather glorious ?

“ For if the ministration of condemnation,  
 “ be glory, much more doth the ministration  
 “ of righteousness exceed in glory .”

St. *Paul*, opposing the Ministers of the gospel to those of the law, calls the first the Ministers of *righteousness* and the *spirit*, while the last are represented barely as the Ministers of *condemnation* and the *letter*. But if they had preached up the doctrine of redemption and a future state, why might they not have been called the Ministers of *righteousness* and of the *spirit*, as well as St. *Paul* and the Preachers of the Gospel ?---On this supposition the Preachers of the Law would indeed have had the more glorious and honourable employment, as they would have been commissioned to teach *the promise of the life that now is*, as well as of that *which is to come*, while the Preachers of the new Covenant were confined only to the latter part : in a word, they would have been ministers of the *Christian* as well as the *Mosaic* dispensation, of the *spirit*, as well as of the *letter*.

2 Cor. iii. 6, 7, 8, 9.

To

To justify, therefore, the superior dignity and pre-eminence of the Gospel ministry, we must suppose, that the commission to Moses and the Prophets was limited to the bare letter, or temporal sanctions of the Law. Nor let it be said, that the Ministers of the Law dealing in *types* and *figures*, and the Ministers of the Gospel in *plain* and *open speech*, was sufficient to establish the difference St. Paul here puts between them: Since if the types and figures were explained to those to whom they were delivered, or were otherwise understood by them, these various modes of information would have made no more difference between the Prophets and Evangelists, than the speaking *Hebrew* and *Greek* would make between St. Matthew and St. Paul.

Had the types and figures been explained, or otherwise understood, how could the Apostle have said that *the letter killeth*, or have called it the *ministration of death and condemnation*? For in this case the temporal blessings promised by the letter of the Law, would have been considered as so many *earnests* and *pledges* of such as were spiritual and future; and the old Covenant would have been *essentially* the same with the new, as it was appointed to inculcate and convey the main substance, and the most important articles of the Gospel.



On the whole, if my Lord Bishop be right in asserting, "that the Law affords a good proof of a future life," St. Paul must have been wrong in declaring that it's public ministers were not commissioned to teach it. For is it not absolutely incredible, that their instructions should have limited them to the lower and inferior sanctions of the Law, without allowing them to enforce such as were of most importance? especially as they had to do with a perverse, licentious, and ungovernable people, whose constant apostacies and rebellions made it necessary to urge EVERY motive, that tended to restrain, and keep them in order.

The Apostle proceeds, --- "And not as *Moses*, which put a veil over his face, that the children of *Israel* could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is abolished<sup>h</sup>," i. e. the Law. Here we are told that *Moses* cast a veil over his face, and endeavoured to hide the end of the Law, (i. e. the spiritual or new covenant) from his people. A very preposterous and absurd conduct, if this covenant was intended for the religion of those times. For if he did not put out the eyes of his people, as his enemies objected to him, yet he endeavoured to render them of no use, by casting

2 Cor. iii. 13.

a veil

a veil or shade over the object, which ought to have been openly exposed and held up to their full view,

Again: "Now I say that the heir as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all,

"But is under tutors and governors, until the time appointed of his father.

"Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world; but when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his son made of a woman, made under the law;

"To redeem them that were under the Law, *that we might receive the adoption of sons.*

"And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba father."

"Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ<sup>1</sup>."

According to this representation, the Jews while under the Mosaic dispensation, had their relation of *children of God* suspended, and were in the capacity of *slaves* or *servants* only. But the right to the *inheritance* of eternal life depends entirely upon the rela-

<sup>1</sup> Gal. iv. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.



tion we stand in to God of *sons* and children, "If a *son*, then an *heir* of God <sup>k</sup>,"—"If *children*, then *heirs*; *heirs* of God, and joint-  
"heirs with Christ <sup>l</sup>." The *Jews*, therefore, while under the suspension of this relation, and confined to the bondage of the Law, could have no expectation of this inheritance.

And yet the defenders of the common system contend, "that the *Jews*, before the  
"coming of Christ, had a *covenanted* right  
"to all those benefits of his mediation which  
"Christians are now intitled to, *i. e.* to grace  
"and pardon of sin here, and eternal glory  
"hereafter <sup>m</sup>." That is, tho' St. Paul considers the *Jews* as under the relation of *slaves* or *servants* only, yet these men will consider them as under the relation of *sons* and *children*. Unless, to avoid shocking our Piety, they take still greater liberties with our Understanding, and say, the *Jews* were under a state of *bondage* and *sonship* at the same time: no matter for St. Paul's opposing these two states to one another, as *inconsistent*.

It may be said, that Paul speaks of the *Jews* as *sons*, when he declares that to *them* "per-  
"tained the *adoption*, and the glory, and the  
"covenants, and the giving of the Law, and

<sup>k</sup> Gal. iv. 7.

<sup>l</sup> Rom. viii. 7.

<sup>m</sup> Stebbing's polemic Works, p. 87.

"the service of God, and the promises".

But we may observe, that this is when he puts them in contradistinction to the *Gentiles*. He then indeed affirms, that *the adoption* belonged to them. When he speaks of the *Jews* in contradistinction to the *Christians*, he then declares that they had not attained *the adoption*, or were not *children, sons and heirs* of God.

The *adoption*, therefore, *allowed* unto them, must needs be something very different from the adoption *denied* them, that adoption which implied a right to the inheritance of eternal life. For if the *adoption*, the *covenants*, and the *promises* mentioned in the epistle to the *Romans* (and so often produced by the defenders of the common system, to prove the Jews had a *covenanted* right to all the benefits of Christ's mediation) signified the being *heirs of God through Christ*, mentioned in the epistle to the Galatians, how could they be at the same time said to be under the bondage of *slaves or servants*?

<sup>a</sup> Rom. ix. 4.

° A late writer observes, that the *GENTILES* are never said in the New Testament to be *born again*, upon their admission into the Christian church. And this he attempts to account for in the following manner. "But where do we find such phrases used concerning such as were converted from among the *idolatrous Gentiles*? And the reason is evident, the *Jews* and *Proselytes* were already  
Let



Let us return to the epistle to the *Hebrews*. In one place we are told, that "the good tidings of salvation (*i. e.* eternal life) began FIRST to be spoken by *Jesus Christ*."

In another it is declared "that the way into the holiest of all (*i. e.* Heaven) was not yet made manifest, while as the first ta-

"born, or admitted into God's temporal kingdom. If therefore they were admitted into the *spiritual* kingdom; they must be *born again*: Whereas seeing the *idolatrous Gentiles* never were the people of God before, their admission into the Christian church could only be called a *being born*; but could with no propriety be called a *Being born again*." Dr. *Bens:n* on *Titus* iii. 5.

Here we must recollect, that St. *Paul* often speaks of the work of redemption by Christ as a *new creation*. Now as it must have been at least as much a *new creation* to the *Gentiles* as to the *Jews*, why might not the first be said to be *born again*, as well as the last?

The learned person seems to fancy, that the *regeneration* of the *Jews* could only be opposed to their previous state of adoption under the Law. But why might it not be opposed to their *natural birth*? This must have been the case, as the regenerated state was styled a *new creation* in opposition to the *old* one, or the natural production of things.

"That which is *born of the flesh*, is *flesh*; and that which is *born of the spirit*, is *spirit*." *John* iii. 6.

"Being born again, not of *corruptible seed*, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." *1 Peter* i. 23.

Two texts which seem entirely to overthrow the learned person's observation, concerning the *new birth*, or the being born again, as if the spiritual kingdom of Christ was opposed to the temporal kingdom of God; whereas it is the *spiritual birth* which is opposed to the *natural*.

*Heb.* ii. 3.

"bernacle

"bernacl<sup>e</sup> was yet standing<sup>1</sup>." The inspired writer would not have said, *the way to Heaven was not yet made manifest*, if the *Jews* had been taught to expect eternal life by the Redeemer of the world, or had been instructed in the means of salvation revealed in the Gospel.

He says also, that "the Law had a *shadow* of good things to come, and not the "*very image* of the things<sup>2</sup>." To justify this representation, we must suppose the spiritual blessings, of which the Law is typical and figurative, were delineated so obscurely under these types and figures, as not to have been obvious to those to whom it was given. For had they seen that these spiritual promises were *virtually* contained under the temporal ones, not the *shadow*, but the *very image* and *picture* of the good things to come, would have been offered by the Law.

Consequently the Author of this epistle did not believe, with the learned Prelate, that "the Law afforded a *good proof* of a future "life." For a Shadow, to which he confines the *Jews*, is a *good proof* of nothing, but of a Substance kept out of sight, and of

<sup>1</sup> Heb. ix. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. x. i.

E . . . . . which



which they could know only this, that it was *something*.

“ The Law (says this Writer) made no-  
 “ thing perfect, but the *bringing in* of a bet-  
 “ *ter hope* did.” The translation seems not  
 to come up to the full force of the original,  
 which does not barely say that a better hope  
 was brought in, but that it was brought in  
 AFTERWARDS, or *after* the age of the Law<sup>1</sup>.  
 How then, I ask, could the better hope, or  
 the hope of a future state, be said to be  
 brought in *after* the Law, if it had subsisted all  
 along together with the Law, and had been  
 sufficiently revealed to the Jewish Church?

Dr. Stebbing contends, that the author of  
 the epistle by a *better hope*, “ does not mean  
 “ barely the hope of eternal life, but *the*  
 “ *whole* evangelical dispensation.” This is  
 pleasant: let us give him all he asks, and  
 see what he will gain. If this better hope  
 takes in *the whole* evangelical dispensation,  
 then of course it includes a future state,

<sup>1</sup> Heb. vii. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Illud ἐν in ἐπεὶ αὐτῶν (introductio) significat *post-*  
*erius* aliquid, ut in ἐπιστάσεις (superordinat) Gal. iii. 15.  
 et est locutio satis frequens, *post-introductio* spei melioris  
 pro spes melior *post* introducta. Grotius in loc.

<sup>3</sup> Examination, p. 79.

which

which was an eminent part of the same dispensation. A future state, therefore, will still be one of those points which the author of the epistle supposes to be *brought in AFTER the Law*. But the Dr. vainly busies himself in proving that this better hope does not mean a future state ONLY, when the support of his principles required him to prove that it did not mean a future state AT ALL.

However, he has proved, even against his design as well as purpose, that this *better hope* means ONLY the particular doctrine in question. For the sacred Writer is speaking of something which was wanting to *perfect and compleat* the Law; and the Dr. assures us, that this was nothing but the promise of life and immortality. "If the promise of eternal life had been by the Law, *there would have been no need* (says he) *of any other covenant*."

"He (Christ, says the sacred Writer) also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him *bat had the power of death*, that is, the Devil; And deliver them who *through fear of death* were all their life time subject to *bondage*."

<sup>\*</sup> Ibid. p. 81.

<sup>\*</sup> Heb. ii. 14, 15.



From hence it appears, 1. that the Devil; before the coming of our Saviour, *had the power of death*. 2. That by the exercise of this power he kept the *Jews* all their life time *subject to bondage*. Now if they had the saving knowledge of a Redeemer *to come*, they would have been no more *subject to bondage* through fear of death, than we Christians are with the knowledge of a Redeemer *past*. For the prospect of life and immortality would have as effectually dispelled that fear then, as it has done since.

St. Paul observes, that Death REIGNED under the Law<sup>y</sup>. Hence the author of the *D. L.* infers, that the doctrine of redemption and a future state was not revealed at this time. The inference seems to be just, tho' Dr. Stebbing has ventured to dispute it<sup>z</sup>.

*Death* is represented in scripture in two very different states and conditions, *before* and *since* the coming of our Saviour. In the former period he is described as in his kingdom, exulting and triumphant, as *reigning* and tyrannizing in all the plenitude of power. In the second period he is represented as stript and divested of his terrors; as subdued, and

<sup>y</sup> *Romans* v. 12, &c.

<sup>z</sup> *D. L.* vol. ii. p. 472, 3.  
deposed

deposed from the Empire which he had so long enjoyed. He still indeed retains his existence and his arts; but that power and dominion, which once made him so formidable, is now no more.

If we would know how his Sovereignty was exercised, or in what his kingdom consisted, we must consider how or in what manner men lived under it. Now the Scripture describes them as *sitting in darkness, in the region and shadow of death, and in bondage through fear of him*. For what was the consequence of confining them within the verge of this *region and shadow*, but subjection to *bondage through fear of death*?

The Author of the *D. L.* therefore might safely infer from this *Empire and Dominion*, that the Jews had not the knowledge of redemption and a future state. For how could men, who were comforted and enlightened with this doctrine, be under the impression of *servile awe and terror*, or be said to *sit in the region and shadow of death*?

St. Paul observes, that Jesus Christ **ABOLISHED** death by *bringing life and immortality to light*. And if so, the *Empire and Dominion* of death must have arisen from the



with-holding and keeping back the knowledge of a future state.

My Lord Bishop subscribes to this interpretation, when he says, "The abolishing of death was the bringing to light, life and immortality<sup>a</sup>."

Now if this was the circumstance which *abolished* death, and yet, at the same time, we will hold that a *good proof of a future life* had been afforded by the Law; it will follow that death must have been, if not *totally*, yet *in a good measure*, abolished by *Moses*. And thus nothing considerable would have been reserved for *Jesus Christ*, who was only to give the last blow to an enemy already expiring, who had been deprived of his main power and strength by *another* hand!

His Lordship's principle therefore seems to present us with a very low and disparaging idea of our blessed Saviour's achievements, the principal part of whose office<sup>b</sup> had been discharged before he came: at best it is dividing the honour of the victory between *Moses* and *Jesus Christ*?

<sup>a</sup> Vol. i. p. 208.

<sup>b</sup> I here speak of the office of *Jesus Christ*, considered only as a teacher of divine truth, and not as the Redeemer of mankind. For the present argument has to do with him only under the first character,

How-

However Dr. *Stebbing* insists, that death retains all his former power and dominion, and still *reigns* and triumphs in his kingdom as much as ever; and, what is more, will continue to do so, till he is finally destroyed at the general consummation of all things<sup>c</sup>. But how could St. *Paul* say that *death* was *abolished*, if he was still invested with the same sovereignty and dominion, which he possessed before? He was not *destroyed* indeed, as he informs us in his Epistle to the *Cor.* where he says that *the last that shall be DESTROYED* is death. But there is a great difference between *abolition* and *destruction*; the first referring to *power*, the latter to *existence*.

“The particular import of the original word (*καταργηθῆναι*) is to *make void*, *debilitate*, *enervate*, *disannul*, *abolish*, or *depose*.” And might not death be *dethroned* and *deposed*, or lose his *empire* and *dominion* upon the publication of the Gospel, notwithstanding he was not to be *finally extinguished* before the general consummation.

<sup>c</sup> *Exam.* p. 70. “Death must be said to *reign* so long as his *power* and *dominion* holds; and this will be till the end and consummation of all things: For the *LAST* enemy that shall be *DESTROYED* is death.” [*See p. 57.*]



If the Dr. will still maintain, his opinion, he must maintain too, that death is not *abolished*, and that men still are all their life time *subject to bondage through fear of him*. He must hold, too, that we still *sit in darkness, and in the region and shadow of death, notwithstanding the light with which the day-star hath visited us*.

Let us now consider a few passages of the Old Testament. *David* puts the following questions: "What profit is there of my blood, when I go down into the pit? shall the dust praise thee? shall it declare thy truth?" "Wilt thou shew wonders to the dead? shall the dead arise and praise thee? shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave, or thy faithfulness in destruction? shall thy wonders be known in the dark, and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?"

And these questions he answers in the negative, by saying, "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence". *In death there is no remembrance*

~~\* Doddridge, Romans, vi. 6.~~

\* Psalm xxx. 9. lxxxviii. 10, 11, 12.

\* Psalm cxv. 17.

" of

“ of thee ; in the grave who shall give thee  
 “ thanks?” *Psalms* vi. 5.

Had he believed that a state of future rewards was reserved for the virtuous, he never would have said they were to go, after death, into the land of *silence* and *forgetfulness*, and should have no further opportunity of praising God, or of celebrating his truth and goodness. For where are the righteous less likely to *forget*, or to bury in oblivion and *silence*, the favours and mercies of God, than in that place where they are conferred in the most eminent and ample manner ; that is to say, on their admission into the society of blessed spirits, who are constantly employed in celebrating the goodness of God with hallelujahs and songs of praise ?

St. *Paul* wishes to be dissolved, and to be with *Christ*, which was *far better* than remaining longer in this earthly tabernacle. On the other hand, *David* begs of God that he may be permitted to continue here, or be longer absent from *Christ*, as if persuaded that the change would be for the worse. After this, can we suppose he had the same fullness of revelation with *Paul* ? Had they entertained the same sentiments of a future state, their language and expressions would hardly have been



been so different. For where does *David* wish to be dissolved, and to be with *Christ*? Or where does *St. Paul* speak of death as a state of *silence* and *forgetfulness*, in which there was to be *no more remembrance* of God?

Now what says *Dr. Stebbing* to these things? Why, these passages in the *Psalms* may mean no more than that "the dead  
" cannot set forth God's praise BEFORE MEN,  
" or make his praise to be known UPON  
" EARTH<sup>b</sup>."

The expressions of the *Psalmist* not only imply that they were not to praise God *before the living*, but that they were not to praise him *at all*. It would have been ridiculous to say, they were to go down into the place of *silence* and *forgetfulness*, merely because their praises and acknowledgements of the divine goodness, were not to reach the land of the living. This state of *silence* and *forgetfulness* must import that they were not to set forth his praises either before the living, or before the dead<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>b</sup> *Examination*, p. 64.

<sup>c</sup> Doctor *Stebbing* proposes another evasion of these passages, quoted from the *Psalms*, which is, "that the  
" author of the *D. L.* could not interpret the words in  
" this sense, consistently with his supposition that the

Again:

Again: "The grave, says the Prophet  
"Isaiah, cannot praise thee, death cannot  
"celebrate thee. They that go down into  
"the pit, *cannot hope for thy truth* <sup>k</sup>." But  
why might not the righteous *hope for his truth*,  
or expect to see God's promises to them ac-  
complished and fulfilled *after death*? Where,  
indeed, on the commonly received system,  
could they so naturally look for an accom-  
plishment of these promises, as in another  
life <sup>l</sup>?

"*Jewish prophets had the knowledge of a future state.*"  
*Examination*, p. 62.

But when the author of the *D. L.* says *the Jewish pro-  
phets* had this knowledge, does the Dr. imagine that he  
meant *every* prophet? Or does not *his* citation of these  
passages evidently shew, that the Psalmist was not in the  
number of the Prophets to whom the Author assigns this  
knowledge?

<sup>k</sup> *Isaiah*, xxxviii. 18, 19.

<sup>l</sup> "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go  
down into silence." Psalm cxv. 17.

"I freely own, says the Dissertator, *Peters* on the  
book of Job, "I can make no sense of this passage  
"any other way, than by understanding the word *ham-*  
"methem, (*the dead*) as intended to characterise the *Gen-*  
"tile nations; who having no part in God's covenant of  
"redemption, but being estranged from him by their  
"idolatries and wickedness, *were to be left for ever in the*  
"state of death, so as never more to rise to happiness, at  
"least; whilst God's people, on the other hand, hoped  
"for a joyful resurrection, and a future state of blessed-  
"ness, wherein they should praise God for ever, in the

The



The expression made use of by David and Hezekiah, seemed so strong and forcible; that a late learned Writer<sup>m</sup> supposed the ancient *Jews* might conceive the soul to be in a state of inactivity during the interval between death and the resurrection. But his Lordship's followers cannot avail themselves of this subterfuge; as he contends, that the doctrine of the resurrection was peculiar to the New Testament; and consequently leaves the *Jews* no knowledge of a future state, but that mentioned in the passages above quoted.

"most extensive sense of this phrase." p. 225. a pleasant solution; and founded on a very commodious absence of thought, in which he forgets, that when *David* and *Hezekiah* speak of the dead, as no longer praising God; they are speaking of what they expected would be the fate of *themselves* and the *righteous Jews*, after death. This is so evident from the passages above quoted, that I shall not hazard the obscuring it by more words."

"Mr. *Whiston*.

As the present worthy Master of Peter-house has revived this old exploded hypothesis concerning the sleep of the soul<sup>o</sup>; he must needs confine the revealed doctrine of a *future state* to that of the *resurrection*. He will therefore find it impossible to prove, that the doctrine of a *future state*, in the sense of a *resurrection*, was revealed in the more early ages of the world. For what reason, or shadow of reason, is there to pretend; that the resurrection was manifested, and brought to light in any of the primeval revelations?

\* Vid. a late edition of his *Considerations*.

"Where-

“ Wherefore my heart was glad, and my  
 “ glory rejoiced : my flesh also shall rest in  
 “ hope.

“ For why? thou shalt not leave my soul  
 “ in hell; neither shalt thou suffer thy holy  
 “ one to see corruption.

“ Thou shalt shew me the path of life;  
 “ in thy presence is the fullness of joy, and  
 “ at thy right hand there is pleasure *for ever-*  
 “ *more*.”

From these words his Lordship's followers conclude, ° that *David* expected to enjoy a state of *everlasting* happiness in heaven. However they will permit me to observe, that David often speaks of pleasures to be enjoyed in the *divine presence*; when he evidently means nothing more than the pleasure of worshiping and serving God in his house or tabernacle; and to observe also, that he often speaks of abiding in the tabernacle or house of God FOR EVER<sup>†</sup>. If therefore we are determined to understand the words *for ever* in a literal and strict sense, we may very much embellish and improve the common system; and shew from these texts that David

<sup>†</sup> *Psalms* xvi. 9, 10, 11.

° Vol. ii. p.

<sup>†</sup> *Psalms* xxiii. 6. lxi. 4.

expect-



expected to enjoy a state of *everlasting* happiness, *in the present life*.

This interpretation will give the Deists great advantage. They will say, *David* must have been a very strange sort of man; if he could speak of himself and those righteous Jews as going into a state of *silence* and *forgetfulness*; when he expected them to be going to a state of everlasting happiness *in the presence, and at the right hand, of God*. The ignorant uninstructed Pagans might, as Dr. Middleton says, in a *gloomy hour* expect nothing but extinction; and, when things went better, exult in the delightful prospects of futurity: But to make the Prophet of God subject to these inequalities, presents us with a very grotesque Character. Sometimes he deprecates his future condition in the most deliberate and solemn manner, as a gloomy and uncomfortable situation, which would deprive him of all intercourse with his Maker; and yet sometimes ardently wishes for it, as the perfection of his nature; as the thing which was to bring him into the closest union with God.

He tells us, that good men after death were no longer to retain any *remembrance* or sense of the divine favour. But sure, it would be  
very

very extraordinary, if the *right hand* of God was a place of *silence* and *forgetfulness*; or the *fullness of joy* to be had in the *divine presence*, the extinction of all *remembrance* of the mercies of God.

David himself informs us, that he found it *painful* and *difficult* to account for the prosperity of the wicked: and informs us likewise, that he searched the *sanctuary of God*, or the *divine Law*, for this purpose. And yet he tells us, that the best solution he could find, even in examining these holy oracles, was; that this prosperity was short and transient, and would be soon succeeded by a terrible reverse. “When I thought to know  
“this, it was too painful for me. Until I  
“went into *the sanctuary* of God; then understood I their end. Surely thou didst set  
“them in slippery places: thou castedst them  
“down into destruction. How are they  
“brought into desolation as in a moment!  
“they are utterly consumed with terrors.”

\* *Psalms* lxxiii. 16, 17, 18, 19. “David (says Dr. Jortin) seems to speak concerning himself when he says  
“Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, nor suffer thy holy  
“one to see corruption. He intended, perhaps, no more  
“than this; Thou shalt not suffer me to come to an un-  
“timely end, to be killed by mine enemies, and cast

How



How highly soever we may think of the piety of David, we must have but a very low

“ into the grave : but then the divine impulse which was  
 “ upon him, made him use words which should suit ex-  
 “ actly to Christ, and to himself only in a loose and  
 “ figurative sense. Of this *the prophet himself might be*  
 “ *sensible, and might know that his words had another im-*  
 “ *port, and that they should be fulfilled twice, both in the*  
 “ *sense which he intended, and in the sublimer sense of the*  
 “ *Holy Spirit.* By these means a shade was cast over the  
 “ prophecy, and the sense of the spirit was concealed;  
 “ till the event unfolded it and made it conspicuous.”  
*Remarks on Eccles. Hist. vol. i. p. 195, 6.*

The learned Writer must suppose, that the redemption of mankind by the Son of God was not revealed to the ancient Jews; as he holds that the ancient prophecies delivered it in the secondary sense, which secondary sense was intended for a *veil* or *cover* of the doctrines conveyed under it. And likewise as he supposes that David secreted this doctrine under dark and obscure figures, he must conclude it was revealed as an *uncommon* favour to some *particulars*; and not to be communicated to the body of the ancient Jews.

However, Dr. Jortin asserts, in opposition to the author of the *D. L.*; that David might have the knowledge of redemption and a future state. Let him then reconcile this supposition to the passages, in which he declares that the dead go down into *the place of silence*, retain no more *remembrance* of the divine favours, and praise or magnify this goodness of God no longer. Is this the language of a man who believed a state of future happiness? or do such descriptions of another life ever occur in the New Testament? But it may be said, he spoke the language of those who were less instructed. Suppose this to be the case, we shall still want to be informed; why, in his account of the prosperity of the wicked, he does not add the considerations of future punishment to those drawn from the short and fleeting duration of their present happiness.

idea of his *reason*, if we suppose him ready to sink under the present difficulty notwithstanding the true solution in the doctrine of a future state.

This seems to be a strong presumption, that the Law did not offer any *good proof of a future life*. For we never can imagine that one *so well versed* in that Law, who made it his study *day and night*, could have remained ignorant of the most important and interesting doctrine revealed by it. And yet ignorant he was, or he never could have been so embarrassed and distressed with this difficulty.

My Lord Bishop's own system will not permit him to understand the words of the Psalmist — *thou shalt not leave my soul in hell* — in a spiritual sense. For thus understood, they afford a good proof of the resurrection of the body, as well as of a future state. And yet one main point asserted in his *sixth* sermon is, that the doctrine of the resurrection

If indeed he was so well acquainted with the whole mystery of redemption, The Deists will say, the knowledge of a future state had been bestowed upon him to very little purpose; if he failed to apply so apposite a topic to the solution of his own difficulties.

*See the Errata.*

F

had



had not been revealed in any part of the Old Testament\*.

It would be inconsistent in his Lordship to give these a words spiritual sense, while he maintains in this same sermon, that the doctrine of a future state, as revealed in the Old Testament, was *left involved in doubts and uncertainties*: for, according to the spiritual sense, here is as plain a declaration of a future state, as any that occurs in the New Testament.

His Lordship will not contend for this spiritual sense, since he so strenuously maintains,

\* Three of the principal texts, alledged by Dr. Stebbing against the argument of the *D. L.* are fetched from *Isaiah*, *Ezekiel*, and *Jeremiah*. — *Examination*, p. 113

“Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise, &c.

“Can these dry bones live, &c.

“Many that sleep in the dust shall awake, &c.”

If these passages prove any thing with respect to a future state, they will prove that the resurrection was revealed at this time. As the Bishop therefore denies the knowledge of this doctrine to the Jewish Church; he must tell the Dr. that these passages were understood in a *temporal* sense, and consequently make nothing against the author of the *D. L.*

If we are not to believe that the resurrection was revealed, why are we urged with these, and other passages of the same sort, which, if they relate to a future state, extend to the resurrection also? And if we are to believe that it was revealed, how was a future state *brought to light*, or even *illustrated and enlightened*, by *Jesus Christ*?

in

in his *third* sermon, that the doctrine of life and immortality was *a mystery* at the time when this Psalm was composed.

The book of Psalms abounds with typical descriptions and representations of a future state. His Lordship contends that these were employed for a veil or cover. And can he suppose that David was industrious to hide this doctrine in one Psalm, and yet studious to publish and divulge it in another? However this would be the necessary consequence of supposing that *any* of the Psalms afforded a *plain and obvious* proof of a future state.

I now proceed to examine some objections which have been urged against the principles defended in these papers.

The learned Prelate insists, that the *natural* arguments in support of a future state must be excluded and set aside, if we assign the *first* and *original* publication of life and immortality to *Jesus Christ*.

I did not expect to find his Lordship so solicitous about the fate of these *natural* arguments, as he affirmed in his first sermon, "that to them who rely on nature only, it is  
"not evident, nor can it be, whether any  
"future reward shall attend their religious

Vol. i. p. 187, 188.

F 2

"service."



“ service.” In another place he asserts that the claims of natural religion amount to just nothing, as being “ the claims of *unprofitable* “ servants, or the claims of those to whom “ nothing is due.” He observes next, “ that nature sees all her children go down to “ the grave: all beyond the grave is to her “ one *wide waste, a land of doubt and uncer-* “ *tainty*: when she looks into it she has her “ hopes, and she has her fears; and, agita- “ ted by the vicissitude of these passions, she “ finds no ground whereon to rest her foot.” Having thus overthrown the claims of natural religion to any future reward, towards the conclusion of his *fifth* sermon; he begins his *sixth* with observing that the natural arguments for a future state would be impeached, if we suppose that *Jesus Christ* gave the *first* and *only* notice of life and immortality. But why is his Lordship so extremely anxious for these natural arguments in favour of a future state and immortality, if they be in reality such slender things as he has described them, but a very few pages before? Or why so much concern in his *sixth* sermon to provide for arguments, to which he had just be-

fore given such a precarious existence in his *first and fifth?*

In order to remove this objection I must premise, that the *natural* and *revealed* doctrines of a future state are very different. The best of men by the light of reason can expect only some slight and inconsiderable reward of a *short and transient* duration; as this might be a sufficient compensation for all their services and sufferings, in the present life. On the other hand, revelation promises a recovery of our *lost inheritance*\*, or a state of *immortal* happiness and glory. And this is justly represented as the pure *gift* or *gratuitous favour* of God, since it flows intirely from his pleasure and good will, and is not to be deduced from any of the divine attributes by the light of

\* I have here borrowed the distinction of that great and illustrious writer from whom only we are to expect a full and final solution of the several difficulties relating to this question. "A future state, taught by revelation, is not *immediately* founded on the same principle with that taught by natural religion. The latter stands *immediately* on this principle, *that God is just, and will give to every man according to his works*; therefore if the distribution of good and evil be not made here, it will be hereafter. But the future state of revelation stands *only mediately* on this, and *immediately* on its being a *restoration to a lost inheritance, purchased by a Redeemer*." — Dr. Warburton's Letter to Dr. Middleton, annexed to the argument of the D. L.



nature and reason. Now as the NATURAL and REVEALED doctrines were so very different, why might not the late publication of the one be very consistent with the early notice of the other; or why might not the one be *originally* revealed by *Jesus*, notwithstanding the other had been previously discovered without his assistance?

His Lordship observes, that some persons think this text of *St. Paul*, "is exclusive of all arguments for a future *immortality* drawn from the light of nature and reason". To prove that they think wrong, he should produce the *natural* arguments by which a future *immortality* may be deduced from the divine attributes, independently on the evidence of revelation. Till he has done this, his objection will amount to just nothing.

To prove that there is any real repugnancy and contradiction between Dr. *Warburton's* interpretation of this text, and the natural argument for a future state, his Lordship must shew that the natural and revealed doctrines

*Who hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.*

*Vol. i. p. 187.*

of

of another life, are one and the same<sup>1</sup>. And to establish this identity, he must suppose that the scripture promise of immortal happiness and glory, or a restoration to our lost inheritance, is nothing more than what may be inferred from the moral attributes of God; one consequence of which is, that Christianity is only a republication of the Religion of nature.

According to his Lordship's objection, a future immortality might be deduced from the moral attributes of God; and consequently would have followed in the natural order and course of things, whether *Christ* had suffered or not. His death and sacrifice, therefore, would have been unnecessary, unless

<sup>1</sup> "Dr. Stebbing, too, asks, "If the ancient heathen legislators taught it (the doctrine of a future state;) or "if the main body of the *Jewish* nation believed it, before the coming of Christ, how was it brought to light "by the Gospel?" *Examination*, p. 72.

But where did he learn that the *Scripture* or *Christian* doctrine of a futurity was taught by the *Heathen* legislators? Or by what *new experiments* will he prove that "the "rabbinical notion of another life, picked up by the "Jews from among their *Pagan* neighbours, and evidently founded on the *pythagoric metempsychosis* \*," was the same with that taught by *Jesus Christ* in the Gospel? For his question has neither pertinence, or force, if the *Pagan* and *Jewish* doctrines differed from the Christian.

\* Vid. Dr. Warburton's letter to Dr. Middleton.



we can suppose they were appointed for the attainment of an end, which had no dependence upon them, and must naturally have followed tho' they had never been.

His Lordship will very much ennoble the natural system, if he can annex to it the promise of a future immortality; but then he must at the same time *paganize* the Gospel institution, divest it of the *essential* doctrine of *Redemption*, and so, sink and degrade it into a mere republication of the Religion of nature. [p. 269]

Again: We learn from the New Testament, that the whole scheme of the redemption of mankind by the Son of God, was discovered to *Abraham* and to some others: Hence it is inferred, that it must have been revealed for the general use and information of the faithful, and consequently was intended for a popular and common doctrine both before and under the Law.

We find in the New Testament *many* passages which declare this doctrine was *not* revealed in these ages, and meet with some *few* which declare it was revealed to certain particular persons. The Deists ask, how we can solve this seeming contradiction, or reconcile the New Testament with itself, since it affirms that the doctrine was a *mystery*,

*kept secret and hid*, and also acknowledges that it was revealed to some particulars in these early ages.

The author of the *D. L.* tells us, that it had been communicated, *as a singular favour*, to some select persons, who were not allowed to communicate it to others, being not, at that time, intended for popular and common use. And is not this distinction naturally suggested by the scripture representation of this doctrine which assigns the *original* revelation of it to *one* age, and the open and *promiscuous* teaching of it to another?

It would be an unpardonable rashness to say the distinction is arbitrary and groundless, as it is impossible to remove the infidel objection, or to save the honour and consistency, of the holy scripture, without it. For if the particular persons to whom the doctrine was communicated, were intrusted to propagate and spread it among the rest of mankind without distinction or reserve, it could have been no more a *mystery* then, than it is now; and consequently the Infidel charge of contradiction and inconsistency will remain in its full force.

My Lord Bishop and Dr. *Stebbing* then will be obliged to follow the author of the  
*D. L.*



*D. L.* in this distinction, and to own that tho' Moses had the knowledge of redemption and a future state ; yet that he delivered this knowledge under the cover and veil of types, i. e. designedly concealed it from his people<sup>b</sup>.

Give me leave to conclude this chapter with a word or two on the common method of defending the *Jewish* Religion, against the objections of Unbelievers; who hold, that this Religion, which is destitute of the doctrine of a future state, is unworthy of God: The advocates of the common system are as ready to own the force of the objection as the enemies of revelation are to make it. Nay, they even outdo the objectors themselves in the force of their expressions. They hold the doctrine to be even *essential* to every Religion which comes from God; and therefore, that Revelation, where it is not found, carries with it an internal mark of the falshood of its pretensions.

But this is so rash and dangerous a concession, that it utterly disables them from making head against their adversaries. For on the truth of this position, in which the two parties so well agree, the doctrine of a future state must have been as much the true

<sup>b</sup> See the following chapter.

and genuine sanction of the *Jewish* Religion, as the Christian: Unbelievers, therefore, will say, it ought to have been as *plainly* and *clearly* revealed by *Moses*, as by *Jesus Christ* and his Apostles. For it seems to be agreed on all hands, that the *sanctions* of a Religion should be delivered in as *open* and *explicit* a manner, as the *precepts* of it.

It is indeed evident, from the nature and reason of the thing, that men ought to be as well informed of the *motives*, which are to promote and encourage their obedience, as of the *duties* which are to be practised and observed by them. The doctrine of a future state therefore should have been delivered to the *Jewish* Church with the same perspicuity and clearness, as the knowledge of the one true God, and the worship and service due unto him, and required by him. So that the patrons of the common system must either give up the truth and divinity of the *Jewish* religion, or prove that this doctrine was as *clearly* and *explicitely* revealed in the books of *Moses*, as in the books of the New Testament.

And yet they know this to be impossible. All they produce are certain passages in which they say, it is *implied*, and from which they  
sup-



suppose it may be deduced by a proper attention to the context, and to the time, occasion, and circumstances of things, when the revelations were made.

But to what purpose is it to produce *implicit* revelations, when the argument requires such as are most *explicit* and *express*? They assure us, that a future state is "that single point of knowledge, which could be the foundation of a reasonable worship," since men would be incapable of religion without it. If therefore *plain, open, and explicit* revelations are necessary in any case, they must have been necessary in this. For though the Jews might be left to discover things of less importance by *deduction* and *inference*, yet they may reasonably look for *direct* and *precise* information, where the very being of the thing delivered, is concerned. Especially if this revelation was made on purpose to assure them of the certainty of a future state.

We have shewn that the doctrine of life and immortality, which is supposed to have been the sanction of the *Jewish* religion, was something *more* than could be deduced from the light of nature; and could be known by revelation only. Now if a revelation was given on purpose to *ascertain* and *promulgate* such

such a doctrine, we must needs conclude, unless we would eternally blast and dishonour the dispensation, that it would not have been *implied* only, but expressed in the most precise, open, and explicit terms.

We learn from the New Testament in what manner this *sanction* of a religion should be revealed. And we never fail to observe, for the honour of the Gospel, that a future state is delivered by it in such a plain, open, and explicit manner, as the importance and usefulness of the doctrine required. Now if this principle was intended for the sanction of the *Jewish* religion, it bore the same relation to their revealed system which it bears to ours; and consequently they were equally interested and concerned to know it with us. But nothing is more evident than that a doctrine, equally necessary to be known at all times, should have been revealed with equal perspicuity at all times<sup>c</sup>. *Implications*, therefore, must have been as improper and unfit in the first ages as the last, if this doctrine was as essential to religion, and consequently as necessary to be known, in the one as in the other.

<sup>c</sup> See argument of the D. L. p. 116.

Indeed



Indeed the patrons of the common system suppose, that the Jewish religion had the very same doctrine of a future state with ours. For they pretend that the Christian covenant, or God's covenant of life and immortality, was revealed in the books of *Moses* for the use of the ancient Jews, in order to acquaint them with God's purpose of restoring mankind to their lost inheritance. They say this covenant was to be opened and unfolded gradually. But if life and immortality was one of the parts which was intended for the *immediate* notice and information of the people of that age; why was it not plainly and explicitly revealed? For it is agreed on all hands, that the promises, stipulated by a covenant, ought to be delivered in the most precise, determinate, and express terms. They should have been delivered in this manner, as they were unknown before; and the covenant was revealed on purpose to make them manifest to the faithful of those times.

\* Promissa, præsertim fœderi annexa, debent esse clara ac diserta, et ejusmodi, ut ab utraque parte stipulante intelligi possint. Bp. Bull's *Harmonia Apostolica*, Dissert. post. c. x. sect. 8. And might not this principle have shewn him, that the Christian covenant of life and immortality was not revealed for the use of the Jewish Church in any part of the books of *Moses*?

Unbelievers

Unbelievers will say, on the authority of the New Testament, that this life and immortality remained a mystery, and was intended to remain a mystery under the Law. And they will add, that there must have been something very singular and incomprehensible in the dispensations of Providence, if this doctrine was to continue a mystery at the very time when it was appointed for the sanction of a revealed religion. Unbelievers object, that no religion, coming from God, can contain any *mysteries*; and we shall hardly remove their prejudices, by adding *the sanctions* of religion to the catalogue. My Lord Bishop observes, that the Gospel-mysteries are things which God reserved to himself, without communicating the knowledge of them to the world, before the coming of the Saviour. And he observes also, that life and immortality was one of these *mysteries*. Now, after this, will he say, it was intended for the *sanction* of the *Jewish* religion?

It is astonishing his Lordship should assert that *the covenant*, by which God engaged to restore mankind to life and immortality, was revealed almost at the beginning of the world, and was often revived and re-published

• Vol. i. Sermon iii. p. 133, 4, 5.

both



both before and under the Law, and yet should contend, that the doctrine of life and immortality was all the time a mystery, which he reserved within his own breast. For how is it possible that a doctrine could remain a mystery, after the covenant in which that doctrine is contained, was revealed?

The advocates of the common system pretend, that the Jewish religion would have been unworthy of God, unless it were established on the sanction of a future state. The Deists, therefore, to convict it of imposture, need only produce those passages of the New Testament, which so plainly and strongly declare that the Mosaic Religion had it not. Thus they will find themselves enabled to turn the Christian religion against the Jewish, and to dispute the mission of Moses and the prophets upon the authority of Jesus Christ and his apostles<sup>f</sup>.

<sup>f</sup> As I have been here examining Whether the writers, who suppose a future state was a *fundamental* and *essential* part of religion at all times, and under all dispensations, be able to remove the infidel objection abovementioned; it may not be improper to consider the opinion of the reverend Dr. Fortin, who has touched this argument, tho' very slightly, in his late *Dissertations*. He tells us, that the Pagan "notions of the soul seem not to be the result of reasonings upon the nature of God or of man; but the remains of an *old tradition*, delivered down, in

The

The constant cry is, and it has been sounded very tragically, that we give the unbeliever

“all probability, *from the beginning of the world*, and “spread through *all nations*.” p. 233.

Thus he supposes the doctrine of a future state was originally revealed *at the beginning of the world*, and handed down by *tradition* to the *Jews and Gentiles*. The question therefore is, whether *these principles* will furnish any solid and satisfactory answer to the infidel objection, which supposes the Jewish religion to be unworthy of God, because it does not contain this doctrine?

Now I think they will not: for the Deists say that nothing but a *plain* and *explicit* revelation of this doctrine will justify the conduct of providence, if it was intended for the *sanction* of the Religions of the ancient world. And they may venture to affirm, without the least fear of being confuted, that the learned Writer will never be able to prove his *tradition* to be such *plain* and *explicite* revelation.

They will add, that the supposition of such a tradition is the defending the Old Testament at the expence of the New, as it is evidently inconsistent with the several passages of the New, explained in this chapter.

It will not mend the matter to say, that as the doctrine had been revealed near the beginning of the world, a subsequent revelation was not necessary in the times of *Moses*. For this would be ascribing that virtue and authority to tradition in our disputes with Infidels, which Papists contend for, and which is not granted, in their disputes with us.

It will be more inconsistent still to assert against unbelievers the necessity of a *written word*, because doctrines, conveyed by tradition, are soon lost and forgotten, or adulterated with fabulous and impure mixtures; and yet to assert against them, on another occasion, that the most essential and important of all religious principles (*i. e.* the doctrine of a future state) might be safely entrusted to tradition.

G

great



great advantage by supposing that a future state was not intended for the sanction of the *Jewish* religion. But sure we give him much greater, by supposing that it was intended, <sup>for this purpose.</sup> For then he will ask, why it was not as explicitly revealed by *Moses* and the Prophets in the Old Testament, as by *Jesus Christ* and his apostles in the New \*?

And what answer shall we make, when he confronts us with the passages of the New Testament, which declare that the doctrine of life and immortality was a *mystery kept secret and hid* in the age of the *Jewish covenant*? Will he not upbraid us with our folly

It is not strange that the *Abbé du Prades* should ascribe this virtue to tradition\*, since he may do it consistently with the principles of the *Romish Church*. But that Dr. *Fortin*, who often speaks as slightly, and seems to think as meanly of that Church as any other protestant, should yet so highly honour and exalt this *Papish* tradition as to suppose that the principal point of the *Jewish* religion was conveyed by it, is not so easy to comprehend.

The emptiness and futility of this reasoning, so far as the present question is concerned, has been sufficiently exposed in *the Argument of the D. L.* p. 117, 118.

§ How unable Dr. *Stebbing* was to remove the Infidel objection, on the supposition that the doctrine of a future state was a necessary and essential part of the *Jewish* religion, may be seen likewise in *the Argument of the D. L.* p. 118—125.

\* See his Thesis and Apology. 1780

and prevarication in setting aside the authority of one half of the Bible, in order to establish the other?

If we be resolved to adhere to the common system, and to defend the Jewish religion on those principles, we shall be obliged to take great liberties both with the Old and New Testament. It will be necessary to *add* many *plain* and *explicit* revelations of a future state to the Old: and it will be as necessary to strike out of the New, all those passages, which suppose this doctrine was reserved for the teaching of our Saviour.

One would indeed suspect, that these passages had been long erased and forgotten, from the little attention which has been paid to them by some late defenders of revelation. "For we are told, that the true religion, given  
" by God, has always been SUBSTANTIALLY  
" the same, or that the promise of a restoration to the life and immortality forfeited  
" by the fall had been revealed to our first  
" parents, and ever after continued a part  
" of the primitive religion derived from  
" them <sup>h</sup>."

<sup>h</sup> Dr. Leland's View of Deistical writers. Vol. ii. p. 479, 480. 578, 579. Vol. i. p. 427, 8.



Happily for the sacred scriptures, the learned Doctor has only asserted, and not proved, these positions. For had he proved them, the consequence had been dreadful. It would have convicted the many passages produced in this chapter from the New Testament of the most palpable and direct falsehood.

I would ask, whether the author of this *View* proposes to establish his hypothesis on the authority of the Old or New Testament? If on the first, he makes the Old Testament inconsistent with the New. If on the last, he makes the New Testament inconsistent with itself.

Even my Lord Bishop himself will be embarrassed, if he should engage to remove the infidel objection, which supposes the Jewish religion was unworthy of God, because it had not the doctrine of a future state. He does, indeed, tell unbelievers, that our SAVIOUR says, the law afforded a good proof of a future life<sup>1</sup>. But they will say, he also tells them, that this was a *mystery*, which God reserved to himself, without divulging it to the world, before the coming of Christ. And they will observe withal, that he has collected several

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 188.

passages out of St. PAUL's epistles in confirmation of this last assertion \*.

They may perhaps therefore be bold enough to tell him, that according to his interpretation, as well as Lord Bolingbroke's, *Jesus Christ* taught *one* doctrine, and St. *Paul* *another*; and the apostle sent, not to establish, but to overturn, one of the principal positions laid down by his master.

The supporters of the common system are often reminding us, "that God, consistently with his wisdom and goodness, COULD not omit revealing this doctrine to the *Israelites*." That is, God *could* not, consistently with his wisdom and goodness, omit to reveal a doctrine, which the inspired writers of the New Testament assure us was not revealed by him.

And are we to believe, on the authority of the common system, that God *ought* to have done, what these inspired writers declare he did not do? Is not this erecting a system on the ruin of the gospel dispensation? Or, more properly, is it not preferring *human* wisdom to the *divine*?

The objection, therefore, can make but little impression on the believer, who no more at-

\*Vol. i. p. 133, 4, 5.

tempts to *mend* the works of grace than those of nature, and presumes not to dictate and prescribe in what manner God *should* or *ought* to have acted, when the written word has informed him in what manner he really did act.

It is much better calculated to serve the cause of the libertine, as it will enable him to prove, on the authority of the *New Testament*, that God did not do what he should or ought to have done in the *Old*. Allow him but this principle<sup>1</sup>, and you put the sceptre in his hand, or authorise him to *rejudge his God*, and to *weigh his opinion against providence*.

It is absurd, therefore, to inculcate the necessity of supposing, that the *Jewish* religion had a future state, as necessary to the defence of it. The believer will not think himself at liberty to assume a principle, which is flatly contradicted by the *New Testament*, or to assign the *Jewish* religion such a degree and measure, of perfection, as neither *did*, nor *possibly* could belong to it, if the *Christian* be true.

To say he shall be unable to defend the Law, without assuming this principle; is in

<sup>1</sup> *Viz.* That God *ought* to have revealed this doctrine to the ancient *Jews*.



effect to say, he shall be unable to defend the Law, without giving up the Gospel.

We are often told, it would have been *cruel* in God to leave the *Jews* under a continual subjection to the fear of death, without any prospect or expectation of a better life. Which is only saying in other words, and in contradiction to the New Testament, that it would have been *cruel* in God, to leave the *Jews sitting in darkness, and in the region and shadow of death*; or to have suffered them to continue *subject to bondage through fear of death*, during the whole period of their lives.

The followers of Lord *Bolingbroke* will not be displeased to hear, that it was CRUEL in that God whom he accuses of cruelty, that he did not communicate the doctrine of life and immortality to the antient *Jews*. For as *St. Paul* evidently ascribes this conduct to him, they will think this sufficient to justify all the venom and malignity, which their master has so copiously shed on the character of the Apostle. The only question is, whether the passages of the New Testament above quoted do, or do not imply, that God did leave the *Jews* without the promise of life and immortality? For if they imply that

he did, we Christians are obliged to believe it. And if we be assured, upon this proper and sufficient authority, that God really acted thus, all objections to the justice and wisdom of such a dispensation must fall to the ground.

The writers, therefore, against the author of the *D. L.* should be very cautious how they leave him in possession of these several texts. For it is leaving us in possession of the fullest evidence, that the *Jewish* religion, notwithstanding it was given by God, was not established on the sanction of a future state. And all objections to the rectitude, justice, and wisdom of this proceeding, are precluded, if in reality the proceeding was of God.

To place things in their true light, we must suppose these objections addressed to the writers of the New Testament. For *they* are equally concerned in this question with the author of the *D. L.* since it is *on their authority* that he denies the *Jews* the knowledge of a future state.

When he is insulted, therefore, on this account, we should recollect that he denies it on the authority of the inspired writers; and recollect likewise that my Lord Bishop has *sometimes* denied them this knowledge, on the  
very

very same authority <sup>m</sup>. The only difference is, that the Doctor is all along uniform and consistent with himself, by steddily adhering to one principle, while the learned Prelate alternately lends his authority to each side of the question, just as the purpose of his present argument requires.

The Doctor has indeed been charged with a kind of sacrilege, an attempt to *rob* and *deprive* the *Jewish* religion of its great ornament and support, the doctrine of a future state. But let his accusers first prove that this *ornament* was amongst the sacred utensils of the temple. And when they have done this, they may, in order to perfect and complete their victory, involve the writers of the New Testament in the same charge <sup>n</sup>.

<sup>m</sup> Sermons, Vol. i. p. 135.

<sup>n</sup> The principal design of this chapter was to shew, that the ancient *Jews* had not the *revealed* doctrine of a future state. And so far the learned Dr. *Sykes* entirely agrees \* with the author of the *D. L.* However, he differs from him in assigning them the *natural* doctrine of a futurity. We shall consider his particular opinion, when we come to examine in what manner he would account for the absence and omission of a future state in the *Mosaic* Law. He, my Lord Bishop, and Dr. *Stebbing*, have undertaken this question, as well as Lord *Bolingbroke*. And I am sorry to say, that they have not

\* Paraphrase on the epistle to the *Hebrews*, p. 203, 4, 5, 6.



In a word, it is not for Beings of our narrow and limited capacities to reason *a priori*, or to dictate to God in what measure and proportion he *should* have revealed his will to the ancient *Jews*. If we would know what was fit to be done at this time, our only way is to fit down, and enquire what he actually did do. And if we will allow the Writers of the New Testament to be competent judges of this matter, we must own, that the doctrine of life and immortality was *not* revealed at this time; and therefore not fit to be revealed.

As those glorious ministers of truth have attested this fact, it will be equally the business of *all* believers to satisfy and discharge the several objections which are brought against a Religion thus circumstanced; that is, destitute of the principle of a future state. For they are not levelled at any *one* sect or party *in particular*, but bear with equal force against *all* who undertake the defence of revealed Religion. The writers, therefore, who have been so long asserting

succeeded better in their *experiments* than the noble Lord; for that the conduct of *Moses* seems to be as *capricious*, *irrational*, and *absurd*, on *their* principles, as on those of the noble Founder of the *first philosophy*.

the

the force, validity, and importance of these objections, have all the time been putting arms into the hands of Unbelievers, which they may turn against us at their pleasure.

*Hoc Ithacus velit, et magno mercentur Atride.*

## CHAP. II.

*Remarks on the Bishop of London's defence of the ancient prophecies; with some observations on what has been lately advanced by Dr. Middleton <sup>a</sup>, and Dr. Sykes <sup>b</sup>, on the subject of types and secondary prophecies.*

THE purpose of these sheets is to shew; that the common system, which makes redemption and a future state, a popular doctrine amongst the ancient *Jews*; abounds with absurdities and inconsistencies. In the foregoing chapter I have proved; that this notion is confuted by the plain and express authority of the *New Testament*. In this I shall endeavour to shew, that it will disable us from defending the *Old*; or giving a satisfactory answer to the objections, which Unbelievers bring against the *ancient prophecies*. And perhaps the futility of this system, cannot be better or more effectually exposed, than by

<sup>a</sup> See his *Examination of the Bishop of London's discourses, &c.*

<sup>b</sup> See his *Notes and paraphrase on the epistle to the Hebrews.*

shewing



shewing to what great and inexplicable difficulties it reduced this truly learned Prelate, in his defence of *types* and *secondary* prophecies, against Mr. Collins, the author of *The grounds and reasons*, &c.

It may be the more seasonable to review this debate, since Lord Bolingbroke seems so well satisfied in his ridicule of these modes of information; which he considers only as so many *convict* impertinencies and whims, unworthy the attention of a rational and thinking man<sup>e</sup>. Now as he has not condescended to reason on the subject, or to specify and point out his particular objections; we can at best but conjecture what they might be. And as he was not famous for striking out any new lights of his own; we may reasonably presume, that Mr. Collins was his Oracle on this occasion, as well as on others; and that he looked upon the arguments, advanced in *The grounds and reasons*, against types and secondary prophecies, as so many unanswerable truths.

*These* arguments suppose, *first*, that the modes of information are neither reasonable, just, nor proper; as not agreeable to the rules of fair criticism and sound logic.

<sup>e</sup> Vol. iv. p. 283, &c. "There is no room for reasoning about the two former." i. e. types and figures.

zally, Had they been properly and strictly logical, yet they would not have been made use of in a revealed Religion; because such a one can have nothing to hide from those to whom it is delivered.

My Lord Bishop replies as follows: " It can hardly be supposed, that God intending finally to save the world by *Christ*, and the preaching of the Gospel, should give an intermediate Law, which had no respect nor relation to the covenant, which he intended to establish for ever: And whoever will be at the pains to consider seriously the whole administration of providence together, from the beginning to the end; may see, perhaps, more reason than he imagines, to allow of types and figures in the Jewish Law<sup>d</sup>."

He undertakes to shew; that we may naturally and reasonably expect to find types and figures in the Old Testament. It was his business then to prove, that they were properly and strictly logical; and not the product of a warm and heated imagination, but founded on real and solid principles of reason. Now, as he has not attempted to do this, he leaves the first objection of his adversary unanswered; and even untouched.

<sup>d</sup> *Discourses on prophecy*, p. 145. Fourth Edition.

To assume the logical fitness and propriety of these modes of information in a dispute with the author of *The grounds and reasons*, is plainly *begging* the question; which the rules of disputation required should be proved.

To tell the infidel, that they are really found in the Old Testament, unless you have previously cleared and rescued them from the charge of being *unscholastic*, *groundless*, and *absurd*; would be furnishing him with such an occasion of triumph, as the learned Prelate, I dare say, did not intend to give him.

It is then a great, and even fundamental, defect in his Lordship's reasoning; that he did not previously explain and vindicate the *logical fitness and propriety* of these figures\*. A second defect is, that his reasoning does not come up to the point which he undertakes to prove. He is to prove, that in the Old Testament we may reasonably look for *types*; or that particular mode and species of prophecy, distinguished by *this appellation*. All he performs, is, that the Law must have *some sort* of reference and relation

\* The clear and full elucidation of this curious and important point was reserved for the hands of a master critic. See *D. L.* Vol. ii. Book 6. Sect. 6.



to the Gospel; or must predict it, in *some* manner, or *other*. But to what purpose is it to shew, that we may reasonably look for prophecy in *general*, or *some kind* of prophecy, in the Old Testament; when the question relates to that *particular* species and *precise* mode of prophecy, which we call *typical*?

His Lordship, therefore, professes *one* thing, and proves *another*. He asserts the reasonableness and propriety of *types in particular*; but labours only to shew the reasonableness and propriety of *prophecy in general*.

Nay, had he evinced the logical fitness and propriety of types, his argument had been still insufficient; since he was to prove, that this *particular* and *precise* mode of prophecy might reasonably be looked for in the Old Testament; as being well adapted to the nature and genius of the *Jewish* Religion.

Now he has not only failed to support the affirmative; but has laid down such principles, as would naturally lead one to assert the negative; or to maintain, that types are contrary and foreign to the nature and genius of the *Jewish* Religion; and consequently are not to be expected in the Old Testament. He supposes, and it is allowed on all hands; that the spiritual blessings, promised

promised in the Gospel, were the subject of the ancient types. He supposes also, that the *Jewish* Religion was to predict and display these blessings clearly and openly, for the present information of the *Jewish* Church. Now if the nature and genius of the Law required this open and immediate instruction, what occasion was there for so dark and obscure a medium of conveyance as that of Types?

Since his Lordship is forced to acknowledge, that even the *metaphorical* and *figurative* sense of the ancient prophecies was used for a *veil* or *cover*\*, much rather should he have seen, that the *typical* and *secondary* sense was intended for this purpose. If therefore he will contend, that *types* and *secondary* prophecies are properly connected with, and necessarily flow from, the nature and genius of the *Jewish* Religion; he must, in consequence, reverse his other principle; and say, that this religion was not given to reveal, but to hide, the spiritual blessings of the Gospel-Dispensation.

This seems to be the only idea of the *Jewish* Religion, which can support us in making it the proper residence and seat of Types and secondary Prophecies. We must

\* Second Discourse.

H

therefore

therefore either exclude these figures, or admit them under such an idea of the Jewish Religion, as is entirely subversive of the common system.

“ Ought it (says his Lordship) to be  
 “ matter of wonder, that the Prophets, who  
 “ were ministers of both covenants; entrusted  
 “ ed with the counsels of God for the direc-  
 “ tion of the temporal affairs of the people  
 “ of *Israel*; and commissioned to cherish the  
 “ hopes and expectations of a better King-  
 “ dom, to be given in virtue of God’s ever-  
 “ lasting covenant: ought it to be wondered  
 “ at, I say, that they often speak of both  
 “ kingdoms together; *that they make use of*  
 “ *the temporal deliverances, as an argument*  
 “ *to encourage the hopes of the spiritual?*  
 “ When in truth the temporal deliverances,  
 “ being the actual performance of one cove-  
 “ nant, were a great security for the per-  
 “ formance of the other, and it was unnatu-  
 “ ral to see the hand of God performing one  
 “ promise, and not to reflect upon the cer-  
 “ tainty of his performing the other.”

He here supposes, that these spiritual bless-  
 ings were prefigured by types; and those Types  
 explained to the people at the same time to



be *Types*, i. e. significative of spiritual blessings to come. Thus the same figure served equally to inform the people both of the *primary* and *secondary* sense of Prophecy. Which we may believe, when it can be proved, that the same circumstance was both fit to be secreted, and fit to be revealed, at one and the same time, and to one and the same people.

In these Discourses, his Lordship undertakes to illustrate and explain the *use* and *intent* of the ancient Prophecies. But what *use* and *intent* can he ascribe to *Types*, if the doctrines, delivered under them, were designed for popular and vulgar notice?

The question is, why *types* and *secondary prophecies* were used on certain occasions rather than such as were primary, literal, and direct. Now what can be said to justify this *preference*, if the doctrines, conveyed under them, were to be nakedly and openly revealed, as being intended for the immediate instruction and information of the ancient *Jews*?

The great point affirmed in the passage just recited, is this; "That the prophets OFTEN made use of the temporal deliverances, as an argument to encourage the hope and expectation of the spiritual."

One would conclude, from his Lordship's manner of expression; that these temporal deliverances had been **OFTEN DECLARED** to be prefigurative of the spiritual. And yet, upon examination, we find *no declarations* of this sort in the Old Testament; but on the contrary the most profound silence.

To proceed. "Ought it to be wondered at (says his Lordship) that they *often* speak of both kingdoms together; that they make use of the temporal deliverances, as an argument to encourage the hopes of the spiritual? When in truth the temporal deliverances, being the actual performance of one covenant, were a great security for the performance of the other."

Having supposed that the temporal deliverances were *previously declared* to be figurative of the spiritual; he addresses himself to shew, that this is no more than what might be expected from their natural connexion. But this is busying himself to account for a fact which in reality has no existence; since such *previous declarations* were never made.

If these temporal deliverances were indeed appointed to be figurative; his Lordship thinks, that their ultimate intention and design must have been previously opened and explained  
in

in the Old Testament. This is his Lordship's principle, fairly collected from the passage quoted just above. I do not mean to discredit it by saying it is the very principle which Mr. Collins, Dr. Sykes, and Mr. Chubb, have employed to invalidate the reality and existence of all types whatsoever. For if a principle be well-founded, it is of no consequence what they are who have thought fit to abuse it.

However, these men argue thus; "Had the facts and circumstances, which you suppose typical, been really so, their several explanations would have been annexed to them, or previous declarations would have been given to shew, that they were originally intended for this purpose."

But no such declarations are to be found in the writings of *Moses* and the Prophets:

Therefore these facts and circumstances were not originally intended to be typical."

How will his Lordship now defend the reality and existence of types against this argument? He agrees with these writers in asserting the first proposition; and he will hardly venture, on maturer consideration, to deny the second; or persevere in affirming, that types were *originally declared* to be figurative. For this would be persevering in support of a system,



stem, in opposition to the clear and direct evidence of sense.

Could he indeed have produced any such declaration, he might have put a quick period to his dispute with the Deist. For this would be evincing the existence of types on the *plain and positive* authority of the Old Testament; which Mr. Collins allows to be decisive in the present question.

This learned Prelate labours to prove *a priori*, or from the nature and reason of the thing, that types, wherever they are found, must needs have been first delivered with their proper explanation; and from the force of this argument, he will compel us to give up these figures; as we are unable to prove that they were delivered in the manner here prescribed.

His followers would do well to explain, how he came thus to put the labouring oar upon believers, and with such circumstances, as lay them under a necessity either of giving up their cause, or of proving what never can be proved.

If we would know what conduct the *nature and reason of the thing* demand, or whether any previous explanations may be naturally and reasonably expected in this case; we should go to the Old Testament, and examine

amine what has been really and actually done. There we find no such explanations recorded, no such hypothesis as his Lordship lays down supported by *fact*. We may therefore safely conclude, that this argument *a priori* has no force; or that the *nature and reason of the thing* did not demand the conduct assigned by this learned Prelate.

Indeed it is not a little strange, that his Lordship should adopt this argument *a priori*; and infer from the very nature and intention of types, that their explanations must needs go along with them. For what is it better than inferring from the propriety and use of a veil or cover, that there was nothing to be veiled or covered<sup>h</sup>?

<sup>h</sup> As Lord *Bolingbroke* has treated the notion of types with such eminent contempt, it is pity but some late writers had handled it with more caution and consistency. Dr. *Law*, in his *Considerations on the Theory of Religion*, often asserts the existence and reality of types; but gives such a character and description of them, as tends to subvert, rather than support, the credit of prophecies thus figuratively delivered.

He observes, that a future state was delivered by the Law "in figurative representations, *types* and *emblems*\*."

He observes also, "that the Revelations made to the *Jews* were at first all put under a *carnal cover* †."

Thus he supposes, that a future state was put under a *carnal cover*; and yet affirms, that it was publicly taught and cultivated at the same time †. Now what need the

\* p. 98.

† p. 225.

‡ p. 391.

His Lordship, by supposing that those previous declarations were *made*, brings upon himself the difficulty of explaining why they were not *recorded*. For certainly, they would have been the most direct, precise, and circumstantial predictions of the mission of *Jesus*. But as the Old Testament was destined for the support and evidence of the New, one can hardly imagine, that such an illustrious train of testimonies would have been omitted, while others more dark, ambiguous, and equivocal, were inserted in their room.

His Lordship assures us; that the ancient prophecies, *relative to the spiritual covenant, were given to establish and confirm the hopes of futurity*; or the doctrine of redemption and eternal life. But if they were given to explain, and to impress this doctrine on the minds of the people, why were they conveyed under Types? Or why was the Doctrine wrapped

followers of Lord Balingbroke ask more to confirm their master's argument against types, than this concession; that one of the principal doctrines conveyed under them, was intended for popular and common use?

If the Doctor will persist in affirming, that types were intended for a *carnal cover*, let him no longer tell us, that the doctrines delivered under them were publicly taught and cultivated at the same time. If he will persist in affirming, that these doctrines were publicly cultivated and taught; let him no longer tell us of his *carnal cover*, as he has now rendered it of no kind of use.



up in clouds and darkness; if it was to be established, dispensed, and propagated among the faithful of those times? If it was to be thus propagated and dispensed, not only so *thick* a cover as that of Types, but *any* cover whatever must have been unnecessary.

It has been suggested by the enemies of *Moses*, that he put out his people's eyes: But the common hypothesis would rather lead one to imagine, that he had already lost his own. For his blindness must have been deplorable indeed; if he was capable of thinking, that dark, typical, and enigmatical representations were better calculated to convey the doctrine of a future state, (or indeed any doctrine) to a carnal and worldly-minded people, than plain, simple, and literal expression.

On this supposition Lord Bolingbroke might justly say, *There is no room for reasoning about these types and figures.* And yet he would hardly have been so sparing of his arguments; had he seen how easily these things might be applied to the ruin and subversion of the common system.

Let us now take a short review of the argument, as it stands between the celebrated Prelate, and the author of *The grounds and reasons*. Mr. Collins objects, that types  
and

His Lordship, by supposing that those previous declarations were *made*, brings upon himself the difficulty of explaining why they were not *recorded*. For certainly, they would have been the most direct, precise, and circumstantial predictions of the mission of *Jesus*. But as the Old Testament was destined for the support and evidence of the New, one can hardly imagine, that such an illustrious train of testimonies would have been omitted, while others more dark, ambiguous, and equivocal, were inserted in their room.

His Lordship assures us, that the ancient prophecies, *relative to the spiritual covenant*, were given to *establish and confirm the hopes of futurity*; or the doctrine of redemption and eternal life. But if they were given to explain, and to impress this doctrine on the minds of the people, why were they conveyed under Types? Or why was the Doctrine wrapped

followers of Lord *Bolingbroke* ask more to confirm their master's argument against types, than this concession, that one of the principal doctrines conveyed under them, was intended for popular and common use?

If the Doctor will persist in affirming, that types were intended for a *carnal cover*, let him no longer tell us, that the doctrines delivered under them were publicly taught and cultivated at the same time. If he will persist in affirming, that these doctrines were publicly cultivated and taught; let him no longer tell us of his *carnal cover*, as he has now rendered it of no kind of use.

up in clouds and darkness; if it was to be established, dispensed, and propagated among the faithful of those times? If it was to be thus propagated and dispensed, not only so *thick* a cover as that of Types, but *any* cover whatever must have been unnecessary.

It has been suggested by the enemies of *Moses*, that he *put out his people's eyes*: But the common hypothesis would rather lead one to imagine, that he had already lost his own. For his blindness must have been deplorable indeed, if he was capable of thinking, that dark, typical, and enigmatical representations were better calculated to convey the doctrine of a future state, (or indeed any doctrine) to a carnal and worldly-minded people, than plain, simple, and literal expression.

On this supposition Lord Bolingbroke might justly say, *There is no room for reasoning about these types and figures*. And yet he would hardly have been so sparing of his arguments; had he seen how easily these things might be applied to the ruin and subversion of the common system.

Let us now take a short review of the argument, as it stands between the celebrated Prelate, and the author of *The grounds and reasons*. Mr. Collins objects, that types  
and



and secondary prophecies are unscholastic, illogical, and absurd. 2. That they must have been useless, as a true religion could have no mysteries to hide from its followers.

His Lordship leaves the first objection not only *unanswered*, but even *untouched*.

If the followers of Lord Bolingbroke glory in his bare silence with regard to the *first* objection; they will glory much more in the authority of his *positive concession* to support and confirm the second. Nay, they will be like enough to tell us, that the principles, delivered in his Lordship's *defence* of types and secondary prophecies, are as destructive of their nature and existence; as any thing advanced by Collins with a professed design to discredit and expose them. For how could this be more effectually done, than by supposing, as his Lordship does, that the doctrines conveyed under them, were to be nakedly and openly revealed; and that the ancient prophecies, relative to the spiritual covenant, were given to dispense and propagate the doctrines of life and immortality<sup>k</sup>?

<sup>k</sup> The reverend Author of the *Analysis*, as he calls it, of *Lord Bolingbroke's works*, observes; that "certain passages of the Old Testament may be conceived to be at the same time historical, and typical, or prophetical, and to be true both in a literal, and allegorical sense. Nay, on the supposition of inspiration, it is very easy

Dr. Stebbing has not succeeded better in the prosecution of this argument, than his

“to imagine, that the Holy Spirit might sometimes have  
 “more distant views than the penmen of Scripture.  
 “Points, which were no way necessary for these to  
 “know, might be of great consequence to be foretold to  
 “future ages. And in such a case, it would be very un-  
 “fair to say, that the penmen *did not know what they*  
 “*wrote*, though they were not made acquainted with the  
 “whole scheme of providence, or the whole intendment  
 “and design of their own predictions.” (p. 135.)

Here, he supposes that the secondary and typical sense was not communicated to the prophets themselves; much less to the body of the people. He knows too, that a future state was one of the subjects of the ancient types.

He should therefore have been cautious of saying (and perhaps he would, had it not been commonly said before him) that a future state was a popular doctrine amongst the ancient *Jews* \*. For what could Lord *Bolingbroke* have wished more than to see the *Jewish* Religion defended on such principles; as supposed obscurity and darkness to be spread round that Doctrine, which was ordained for one of its principal sanctions? This would naturally have effected what was by no means wanted, the inflaming his prejudices against these Prophecies, as calculated to weaken, rather than to promote the influence of that Religion, which they were given to support.

The reverend Author has given his neighbour other advantages. For, when called upon to account for the absence and omission of a future state in the Law; he even flies to that strange solution, which supposes that its sanctions were addressed only to the society in general, and not to particulars and individuals†. And yet every page, and almost every paragraph, of the Law, might have shewn him; that those sanctions extended to particulars and individuals, as well as to the state in general. See *argument of the D. L.* p. 56—75.

\* p. 71, 72.

† p. 71.

learned Patron. He asserts, that types and secondary prophecies were intended for a veil or cover of the doctrines conveyed under them; and he also makes a future state one of these doctrines<sup>m</sup>. On a late occasion he asks; "Why will these Gentlemen write *against* me, whilst they *give up* the very points which govern the whole question?" If he gains any thing on this question, it must be *given* him; for we have long seen, how unable he is to do any thing for himself. But when he asserts these two propositions, 1. That Types and secondary Prophecies were a cover to the Doctrines conveyed under them; of which Doctrines, *life and immortality* was one; and 2. That *life and immortality* was a popular doctrine amongst the ancient Jews; Does not he give up both himself and his point? *Himself* by a contradiction; and his *point* by one half of it, which owns that life and immortality was hid under the cover of Types and secondary Prophecies. For what can the author of the *D. L.* desire more? Yet Dr. Stebbing still continues to write against him; and with the same virulence and rancour with which he set out<sup>n</sup>.

<sup>m</sup> See argument of the *D. L.* p. 125—143.

<sup>n</sup> It is remarkable that Dr. *Leland*, in his account of  
Dr.



Dr. Stebbing tells us, that a future state was always necessary to be known; as being

*the grounds and Reasons\**, says *very little* of types and secondary prophecies. However, he agrees with Bishop Chandler, that they were intended for a *veil* or *cover*†. His declining this topic is the less extraordinary, as Dr. Stebbing has given those in the common system no great encouragement to revive this part of the dispute. For he has shewn, that a rational and consistent account of types and secondary prophecies, will serve only to expose the nakedness and deformity of that system. But the very little Dr. Leland has said on this subject, will probably be deemed too much. For why did he say, that types were appointed for a *veil*; as this will necessarily lead a reasoner to conclude, that the doctrine of a future state was secreted at that time? He should not in his *first* volume have paved the way for such an inference; since he was disposed to assert, against Lord Bolingbroke, in his second ||, that this was a popular and common doctrine amongst the ancient *Jews*; and he closely follows Dr. Stebbing, both in maintaining that Types were appointed for a *veil*, and that one of the principal doctrines, delivered under them, was *revealed* and taught to every body. Does he not therefore assign the *Jews* the knowledge of a future state at the expence of types? And does he not defend the use and propriety of types on such principles, as will oblige him to acknowledge, that the doctrine of a future state was not known?

How little Lord Bolingbroke had to apprehend from such Reasoning, has been shewn in another place §.

The learned Doctor observes, "that the *mosaical* dispensation was really and *essentially* the same Religion, "for *substance*; which was practised in the ancient patriarchal times." And he supposes, that the ancient patriarchal Religion was the same with the christian.

\* View of deistical writers, Vol. i. p. 113.

† p. 117. || Vol. ii. p. 495.

§ See argument of the D.L. p. 140, 141.

the very vital and fundamental part of all Religion. Upon this it is natural for the followers of Lord *Bolingbroke* to ask, Why then was it not discovered to the ancient *Jews*? The Doctor replies, that it was delivered to them under the cover and veil of types; i. e. was secreted and concealed from them. They might possibly say, in the language of their Master; that *such reasoning was even beneath contempt; that the Lamas, Talapoins, and Bonzes, would have blushed at such a system.*

The Dr. says, the *Jewish Religion* would have been unworthy of God; *if it did not teach* the doctrine of a future state. It must therefore have been unworthy of him; *if it secreted* this Doctrine. If so, the Doctor has

Thus the Patriarchal, the Jewish, and the Christian religions were all *really and essentially the same, for substance*; and consequently were all established on the same promise of life and immortality.

Types, therefore, would have been as useless and impertinent in the Law, as in the Gospel; or, indeed, would have been useless and impertinent at all times; since it never could be seasonable to *hide and cover*, what was always seasonable to open and reveal; *viz. the substantial and essential principles of Religion.*

The learned person will do great honour to the *Jewish Religion*, if he can prove that it was all along known to be *essentially and substantially the same* with the Gospel. But it will lessen the merit of his service, if we reflect, that he at the same time convicts the Gospel of falshood and imposture; for assuming and arrogating to itself discoveries, which had been made so long before by the Law.

done

done his best to overthrow its pretence to a divine original; by affirming that it delivered this doctrine under the cover and veil of types.

According to Him, the principle of redemption and a future state was the whole substance of the religion of those times: and yet this very doctrine was sunk and buried under the cover and veil of types. Thus the Law was given, and God interposed in a very singular and extraordinary manner; not to relume and restore the principal and important doctrines of Religion, but to cover and hide them from his favourite and chosen people.

• No writer more zealously maintains the existence of types, than the Author of the *Remarks on ecclesiastical history*. Vol. i. p. 183 to 188. — 202 to 228.

As he asserts, that they were appointed to cast a veil or shade over the doctrines conveyed under them; and asserts also, that a future state was one of these doctrines; he must, to be consistent with himself, deny the knowledge of it to the ancient Jews.

If he supposes it to have been a part of their Religion, he must suppose that *Moses* was commissioned to hide the principal article of their Religion from them.

However he affirms, in his *Dissertations* (p. 233.) that it was revealed at the beginning of the world; and handed down to the Jews by tradition.

It may seem strange, *Moses* should be employed to throw a veil or shade over a doctrine, which had been discovered and brought to light in one of the primeval Revelations.

It may seem stranger still, that he should attempt to hide a doctrine under types and figures; which his people

He



He supposes, that this principle had been revealed near the beginning of the world,

already had by tradition. For there could have been no harmony and good correspondence between the traditional and written systems; if the grand doctrine, taught openly by the one, was secreted and concealed by the other — “What sense is there in supposing, that he would attempt to hide a doctrine, with which his people, at the same time, were perfectly acquainted. Had there been nothing delivered in types at all, and had there been a *virtual* as well as *actual* silence concerning a future state in the Law of *Moses*, this might perhaps be reconcileable to his *traditional* Religion. But a *tradition* to *discover* it, and at the same time *types* to *hide* it, is such a mode of divine dispensation \*,” &c.

If the doctrine was necessary to maintain the Religion of the ancient *Jews*, the conduct of *Moses* must have been perfectly unaccountable. For he must have been not only destitute of inspiration, but even of common sense; if he cast a veil and shade over a doctrine, which he deemed requisite to support the Faith and Religion of those times. If he did not *put out the eyes of his people*, he endeavoured to render them of no use; by placing the most interesting object where they were least likely to see it.

Lord *Bolingbroke* objects, 1. That the *Jews* had not the doctrine of a future state. 2. That their Religion abounds with types and figures.

In opposition to his *first* objection, the learned Doctor contends, that they had this principle. In opposition to the second, he maintains; that types were necessary as a carnal cover of the spiritual doctrines, conveyed under them; and adds also, that a future state was one of these. But would not the noble writer have thought himself treated with rather too much insolence; if required to

\* *Argument of the D. L. p. 136.*

for the use of the faithful: And then he supposes, that it was put under a veil or cover; in order to keep it from their sight, and consequently to defeat its influence. Thus a subsequent Revelation was added, to prevent their receiving any advantage from a preceding one.

Lord Bolingbroke objects, that *Moses* did not do fairly by his people, that he actually deceived them; <sup>as he did</sup> by not setting before them the full consequence of their disobedience, in the mention of future punishments; but limited and confined his threatnings to such as were temporal <sup>P</sup>.

believe, that they had this doctrine of a future state; and required also to believe, that it was secreted from them.

The Doctor would suppose, with the author of the *D. L.*; that types were originally intended for a veil or cover: And he would suppose, with the advocates of the common system; that the *Jews* had the doctrine of a future state. Thus he attempts to incorporate into his belief two principles, which are essentially destructive of each other.

In short, how disagreeable soever the alternative may be, he must either take party with Lord Bolingbroke, or Dr. Warburton; as he will be obliged either to discard the notion of types and secondary prophecies, or to deny the *Jews* the knowledge of a future state.

Unless he borrows and adopts the principle of the *D. L.* he will indeed leave Lord Bolingbroke no room to reason about types; since the system opposed to him will be gross enough to carry its own confutation along with it.

<sup>P</sup> Vol. iv. p. 153, 4. 8vo.

I

Accord-

According to the learned Doctor, *Moses* not only omitted to set those punishments before his people; but drew such a veil or cover over them, as prevented their enquiry after them.

I should therefore be glad to learn, what expedient the Dr. has to remove the imputation of cruelty and injustice; while he continues to suppose, that future punishments were intended for the sanction of the *Jewish* Religion.

But to return to the learned Prelate. He appears not to be more happy in his account of many other prophecies; than in his solution of the *typical* and *secondary* ones. There are a set of prophecies, which represent the spiritual nature and promises of the Gospel *figuratively* and *metaphorically*, under the temporal and carnal terms and images of the Law.

His Lordship himself affirms, that there are many prophecies thus circumstanced.  
 “Whoever looks into the prophetic writings, will find that they are generally penned in a very exalted style, full of bold figures, describing the judgments and the mercies of God; *representing spiritual blessings under the images of temporal prosperity*, and oftentimes such images as cannot possibly



“libly admit of a literal interpretation.” Now all the prophecies of this sort will be an easy prey to the Deists; if they may be allowed to attack his Lordship on his own principles. For, if the spiritual nature and promises of the Gospel were to be opened and revealed to the *Jewish Church*, why need they have been conveyed under the cover of temporal and carnal images? Or what occasion for a veil and shade, where a doctrine is to lie open and naked, to the sight of all men? Would not this be that specific absurdity of *lighting a candle; and then, putting it under a bushel, and not upon a candlestick?*

The passage, here quoted, occurs in the *second discourse*; wherein his Lordship engages to explain and account for the darkness and obscurity of the ancient Prophecies. He supposes it may sometimes arise from the *metaphorical* and highly *figurative* terms, in which the prophecies were delivered; and he contends, that these *metaphors* and *figures* were appointed for a veil or cover. But the obscurity arising from *hence* had no reasonable end; as the veil and cover which occasioned it had no use: the truth foretold being, it seems, intended for public and common notice.

‘P. 29.      ‘Ibid.

" The blessings belonging to the special  
 " covenant, given to *Abram* and his seed,  
 " were reserved to be revealed in God's ap-  
 " pointed time. The prophets under the  
 " Law could not be commissioned to declare  
 " these blessings nakedly and openly, without  
 " anticipating the time of their revelation.  
 " Hence it is, that the predictions, concerning  
 " Christ and his kingdom, are clothed in such  
 " figures, as were proper to raise the hope  
 " and attention of the people; without car-  
 " rying them beyond the bounds of know-  
 " ledge, prescribed by God to the age of the  
 " *Jewish* Covenant †."

" The blessings here *reserved* to be revealed  
 " in God's appointed time were the spiritual  
 " promises of the Gospel." This time, his  
 Lordship assures us, was not yet come.  
 However, in this very page, within the dis-  
 tance of only ten lines, he affirms; " that the  
 " prophets often made use of the temporal  
 " deliverances, as an argument *to encourage the*  
 " *hopes of the spiritual.*" But could they  
 encourage the hopes of a spiritual deliverance,  
 if the *appointed time* of revealing the know-  
 ledge of that deliverance was not yet come ?

No more than two pages before, his Lord-  
 ship affirms; that the prophecies relative to the

spiritual covenant, were intended to *establiſh* and *confirm* the hopes of futurity, or the spiritual blessings in question. But how could these spiritual hopes be *establiſhed* and *confirmed* in *that* age; if they were *reſerved* to be revealed in a *future* and *distant* one?

The prophets under the Law could “ not “ be commiſſioned to declare these blessings “ *nakedly* and *openly*, without ANTICI- “ PATING the time of their Revelation.”

How could they make use of the temporal deliverances, as an argument to encourage the hope of *the spiritual*; without *declaring these last openly and nakedly*? Or, how could the ancient prophecies establiſh and confirm the hopes of futurity; unless the temporal veil or cover was taken off, and the spiritual promise, couched beneath, was *nakedly* and *openly* exposed?

— “ Hence it is that the predictions, “ concerning Christ and his kingdom, are “ clothed in *ſuch figures*, as were proper to “ raise the hope and attention of the people; “ without carrying them beyond the bounds “ of knowledge preſcribed by God to the “ age of the *Jewiſh* covenant.”

Now these predictions represent the spiritual blessings of the Gospel figuratively,



or under the image of great and extensive conquests, national triumphs, and worldly plenty. Such figures, promising a large increase of temporal blessings, would naturally raise the hopes and attention of the people. But then his Lordship contends, that these figures would seize and engross the whole of their attention; and cast a mysterious repose over the doctrine of life and immortality, which was shadowed out under them.

His Lordship supposes, that nothing more than a *bare figurative representation* of the Gospel blessings was presented to the faithful under the Law. And he supposes, that this *figurative representation* was appointed to hide the *living oracles*, or the spiritual blessings, which lay buried and concealed beneath. For that the people could not have been let into the knowledge of these last, *without carrying them beyond the bounds of knowledge, which God had prescribed to the age of the Jewish covenant.*

This was once esteemed good divinity; and used by his Lordship, in common with the other advocates of Revelation. However, since it has been employed, amongst other things, to demonstrate the *Divine Legation of Moses,*

*Moses*; it has contracted an heretical taint. But this has not hindered his Lordship, I speak it to his honour, from continuing to retain it; notwithstanding all the ill language which his followers have so liberally poured out upon it.

While his Lordship persists in affirming, that only a *figurative* representation, and not a *naked* and *open* exposition of the blessings promised in the Gospel, could be exhibited and presented to the *Jewish Church*; he will be enabled to give a very proper and rational account of the prophecies in question, and may shew, why they predict these spiritual blessings under temporal and carnal images. But then he will be obliged to give up that notion, that the ancient prophecies of the spiritual covenant were given *to establish and confirm the hopes of futurity*; as well as that other, which supposes that the temporal deliverances, wrought under the Law, were *declared* to be figurative of the spiritual ones promised in the Gospel.

It is affirmed by his Lordship, and very justly; that the prophecies of the several periods of the world did all exactly correspond to the state and condition of religion at the

particular times, when the prophecies were given \*. He will not sure make an exception for those prophecies, which convey the doctrine of redemption and a future state, under the cover of a secondary sense, or under such temporal and carnal terms as were proper and peculiar to the law ? But then if such dark and mystical representations did actually *correspond* to the state and condition of the *Jewish* religion; he will own, that the doctrine of redemption and a future state made no part of this system. For how can we suppose, that such carnal and temporal descriptions were any way proportioned to the state and condition of a people; who saw, <sup>or ought to have seen</sup> the doctrine of life and immortality in a full, open, and distinct light ?

My Lord Bishop supposes, that the *Israelites*, at the time of the egression, were sunk into the lowest and grossest superstitions of *Egypt*; and remembered so little of God's revelations to their forefathers, that they knew nothing even of his *nature* and *attributes* \*. Accord-

\* Sermons, Vol. i. p. 286. " With respect to the  
 " people of the *Jews*, miracles had a double use : for by  
 " their long continuance in *Egypt*, they became infected  
 " with the errors and superstitions of the country, and  
 " served their idols. So that they wanted a proof, that  
 ingly



ingly *Moses* reveals to them a system of the several moral and religious duties, which were to be practised and observed by them. But then he requires a very rigorous obedience; without setting before them the grand motive, which the men I am arguing with, say was necessary to encourage and promote it; nay, he was so *capricious* and *cruel* as to hide it from them, by putting it under a veil or cover.

Thus they would once more have been in the hands of a *hard task-master*; who demanded their obedience, without offering the only motive and inducement, which could make it a reasonable service. Their constant desire of returning into Egypt, and their frequent apostasies and revolts, are nothing more than what he might naturally expect under the harsh and arbitrary treatment here supposed.

To say that he acted in this manner, by *his own choice*; would give us a strange idea of the *Jewish* lawgiver. To say, that he acted in this manner by a *superior* direction; would make the God of *Moses* a more capricious, cruel, and unjust being, than he is re-

“ the God of their fathers was indeed the *supreme being*;  
 “ as much as the *Egyptians* themselves.”

pre-

presented by the author of the *first philosophy*.

Dr. *Middleton* would insinuate, that *Moses* was so extremely weak and thoughtless, that he overlooked the doctrine of a future state; notwithstanding it could not be omitted without the ruin of religion \*. And would it not be more for the Legislator's credit to suppose, that he really forgot it; than that he industriously concealed it, and yet expected that it should be publickly taught and cultivated; as being necessary to support the faith and religion of the ancient *Jews*?

Lord Bolingbroke sometimes pretends, that *Moses* knew nothing of this doctrine; and would not one rather suppose he knew nothing of it, than that he was conscious of its importance and use, or believed it necessary to the support of his religion; and yet buried it under a veil or cover?

But to proceed. The Deists urge the *temporal* import of some prophecies, as a circumstance which proves them to be too trivial and inconsiderable to come from God. On the other hand, his Lordship contends that *such* prophecies were seasonable and expedient

\* See his letter to Dr. *Warburton*, annexed to the argument of the *D. L.*

under the Law; because the better hopes of the Gospel, which vacate the promises of the *Mosaic* covenant, were not yet brought in.

“ You see now (says he) upon what foot  
 “ all the prophecies in the Old Testament  
 “ stand, *which relate to the temporal concerns*  
 “ *of the Jewish nation*; you see likewise the  
 “ reason, why this kind of prophecy has ceased  
 “ in the Christian church. The Gospel is  
 “ not founded in temporal promises; so far  
 “ from it, that we are called upon to take  
 “ up our cross, and follow Christ. The  
 “ bringing in of better hopes *has vacated the*  
 “ *promises of the Mosaic covenant*; and 'tis ex-  
 “ pected of us, after so much light given, that  
 “ our faith should be proof against the adver-  
 “ sities of the world; without the help of a  
 “ prophet to foretel, or to reveal to us in every  
 “ instance the counsel of God.”

Now, after this, must not his Lordship leave the infidel objection, against the propriety and use of *these* prophecies, in its full force; if he pretends, with the advocates of the common system, that the doctrine of redemption and a future state, or the better



hopes of the Gospel, were brought in under the Law ?

In vain will his Lordship attempt, if he should attempt, to shew the peculiar propriety and use of predictions, relating to mere temporal affairs under the *Jewish* œconomy; whilst he adheres to the common system. If the doctrine of redemption and a future state does *now* vacate the use of such prophecies under the *Gospel*; it would have

“ To know future blessings of which we shall partake, and to receive an admonition how we may avoid an impending evil, are favours which men would often be glad to receive; and these favours were granted to the people of God in ancient times, and ruder ages, for several reasons, which we have enumerated; but when by his Son he had introduced a purer and sublimer religion, he no longer continued, under the evangelical dispensation, to inform men of such temporal events. It is enough for a christian to know, that he may secure to himself everlasting happiness by his obedience.” *Remarks on ecclesiastical history*, Vol. i. p. 101, 2.

The Doctor seems here to own; that the prophecies, *foretelling temporal events*, are only to be justified on the supposition that the *Jews* had not the knowledge of a future state. If therefore he should chance to assert they had this knowledge, he will be forced to give up these prophecies to the Deists.

And not only these, but typical and secondary prophecies, likewise, together with those which describe the spiritual nature and promises of the Gospel in *metaphorical* and highly *figurative* terms.

Now whether it would be worth while to give up all these things *for the sake of opposing the principles of the D. L.* must be submitted to the judgment of others.

vacated

vacated the use *then*, under the *Law*. If such prophecies were seasonable with the revelation of a future state *then*, they cannot be unseasonable with such a revelation *now*.

“ As two covenants were given to *Abraham* and his seed; (says his Lordship) one a temporal covenant, to take place, and to be performed in the land of *Canaan*; the other a covenant of better hopes, and to be performed in a *better country*; so are the prophecies given to *Abraham* and to his children after him, of two kinds; one relative to the temporal covenant, and given in discharge and execution of God’s temporal promises; the other, relative to the spiritual covenant, given to establish and confirm the hopes of futurity, and to prepare and make ready the people for the reception of the kingdom of God.”

Here his Lordship tells us, that the ancient prophecies may be reduced to two sorts; such as relate to the temporal affairs of the *Jewish* nation, and such as are relative to the spiritual or Christian covenant. He affirms, that prophecies of the *first* kind were seasonable; because the better hopes of the Gospel were not yet brought in. And yet he affirms, that



prophecies of the second kind were designed to establish and bring in, at the time they were delivered, these better hopes of the Gospel. It is evident, therefore, that his account of the prophecies *relating to the spiritual covenant* will oblige him to give up the very ground and foundation, upon which he undertakes to support the prophecies *relative to the temporal covenant*; the first vacating and superseding the very end and purpose, which he assigns to the other. For tho' he affirms, that both temporal and spiritual prophecies were necessary under the Law; yet he assigns the *one* no use, but what must arise from the supposed *absence and omission* of the *other*.

Here he argues on the supposed *absence and omission* of these spiritual prophecies, or of prophecies which plainly foretel the spiritual nature and promises of the Gospel. And yet, in another part of his work, he makes prophecies of this last sort *necessary and essential* to the *Jewish* dispensation<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>b</sup> He observes, that "the prophetic office was in some measure essential to the *Jewish* church; in order to preserve, and to administer the hopes of the Gospel, which had been revealed before the giving of the Law." And these hopes of the Gospel, according to his Lordship,



We have now gone through his Lordship's defence of three particular sorts of prophecy:

1. Typical prophecies, and such as have a double meaning; 2. Those, which represent the Gospel blessings under temporal and carnal images; 3. Those, which relate to the temporal affairs of the *Jewish* people. The result of the whole seems to be this; that nothing, but an uniform adherence to the principles of the Divine Legation, can secure his reasoning from the attacks of infidelity; and nothing, but an uniform rejection of them, can secure it from the attacks upon itself; that is, make it perfectly consistent.

It has been censured as dangerous and heretical in the Author of the *D. L.* to undertake the defence of the *Jewish* religion, on the supposition that it had not the doctrine of a future state. And yet, my Lord Bishop's description and account of these three sorts of prophecy, will oblige him to defend it on this very foot; or give it up to the scorn of Infidelity.

Nay the Deists will say, he is no longer at liberty to assign the *Jews* this doctrine of a future state; since he contends that some pro-

include the promise of the redemption of mankind, or a restoration to life and immortality.

prophe-

phesies were so framed, as to *hide* and *cover* it; and that others were given on purpose to supply the *absence* and *omission* of it.

They will say, he is no longer at liberty to assign it to them; because he affirms, that "it would have carried them beyond the bounds of knowledge, which God had prescribed to that age of the world."

And sure his Lordship's followers will hardly be so imprudent as to remind them, that he asserts the very contrary in other places. For this will neither save their master's honour, nor restore the credit of the old system.

Before I conclude this chapter, I shall just beg a word or two with a pair of well-known Writers against types and secondary prophecies.

Dr. Sykes still continues to treat these modes of information with great freedom\*. And indeed, while he had only to do with the defenders of the old system, had little to apprehend from his perseverance. The wonder is, that he should persist in talking the same language after he had to do

\* See Paraphrase on the epistle to the Hebrews, and second edition of his Essay on the Christian Religion, printed 1755.



with so very *different* a writer; and had received such an answer, as, should have induced him, in mere prudence, not to revive this exploded argument. For this answer, I must refer the reader to the *D. L.*<sup>d</sup> where he will find the subject handled with that force, solidity, and precision of argument; which so eminently distinguish the author from all his co-temporaries, and do indeed shew, that he is not inferior to any writer of any age.

But it is still more remarkable; that the celebrated Dr. *Middleton* likewise, notwithstanding his avowed opposition to all types and secondary prophecies, has yet asserted such principles; as will oblige him to concur with the author of the *D. L.* in all he has advanced on this subject.

These learned persons both own, that there is a strict connexion between the Old and New Testament; or, that the last was to be predicted and prefigured by the first. The question is, in what manner this prediction and prefiguration was to be made. The nature and reason of the thing tells us, it could not be *plainly* and *openly*; because this would have prejudiced the *Jews* against the Law. The learned persons themselves tell us, it could not be *plainly* and *openly*; because the

<sup>d</sup> Vol. ii. Sect. 6. p. 634.



peculiar nature and genius of the *new* Religion, was to remain a mystery, and to be kept secret, at the time of giving the prophecies. Now if it was to be predicted for the use of *future* times, and yet to be kept out of sight of the *present*, the *secondary* sense of prophecy must have been a proper mode of conveyance; as it was excellently well adapted for the performance of both these services at the same time.

Now Dr. *Middleton* and Dr. *Sykes* both suppose, that the things to be prefigured, were to be put under a *veil*, or *cover*; and yet both deny the propriety of a *secondary* sense in prophecy. On the other hand, the Lord Bishop of *London*, and Dr. *Stebbing*, both assert the propriety of a *secondary* sense, and yet both take away the use of a *veil* or *cover*; as they suppose the *prediction* and *prefiguration* were intended for the use of the times in which they were delivered.

The two first oppose the *secondary* sense on such principles, as necessarily tend to establish it: And the two other defend it on such principles, as necessarily tend to overthrow it. Dr. *Middleton* and Dr. *Sykes*, hold, that there was something to be veiled and covered; yet deny there was any *veil* or *cover*: My Lord Bishop and Dr. *Stebbing* hold, that there was a  
*veil*

*veil* or *cover*; yet deny there was any thing to be veiled or covered.

But let us consider the several systems of these learned men a little more precisely.

Dr. Middleton observes; that the scheme of salvation, revealed in the Gospel, was all along a *mystery*, which had been *hid from ages and generations, and kept secret since the world began*.\*

He observes too, that the Christian was a new Religion; "wholly *strange* and *inconceivable*, not only to the wisest of men, but "to the apprehensions even of angels." However, he affirms; that this scheme of salvation, wholly *new, strange, and inconceivable*, was the common subject of the ancient prophecies; or was exhibited and prefigured by them, but in such a manner as would keep it out of sight, since it was to continue a mystery, notwithstanding the prefiguration and exhibition here supposed.†

Since he asserts therefore the propriety and use of such prophecies, as were to have a *veil* cast over them, in such a manner, that the

\* Posthumous piece against Dodwell and Church, p. 46, 47.

† Examination of the Bishop of London's discourses, p. 94. Preface of his Letter from Rome, p. 85, 86.

\* Examination of the Bishop of London's Discourses, p. 93, 94.



thing prefigured in them should not be then understood; how could he dispute the propriety and use of *secondary* prophecies, which afforded that very *veil* whose use he so frankly confesses?

Dr. Sykes too observes; that the scheme of salvation, revealed in the Gospel, was appointed to be the subject of the ancient prophecies; and yet was to remain a *perfect mystery*, 'till the publication of the Gospel<sup>a</sup>. It was therefore to be predicted, and yet to be kept out of sight; i. e. it was to be exhibited under a *veil* or *cover*. And what could he have said more, had his professed design been to inculcate the use and expediency of *types* and *secondary prophecies*?

The author of the *D. L.* attempts to evince the use of these prophecies; by supposing, that the *Gospel* was to be predicted by the *Law*; and yet predicted in such a manner, that a *veil* was spread over its spiritual nature. The learned Doctors concur with

<sup>a</sup> Paraphrase on the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, p. 205, 206.

Essay on the Christian Religion, 2d edition, p. 37, 44, 47, 175.

He supposes, with the author of the *D. L.* that the salvation of mankind was a mystery, which had been kept secret and hid from the beginning of the world; and was not revealed before the publication of the Gospel.



him, in asserting these *premises*; and yet per-  
versely deny an *inference* drawn from <sup>them</sup> ~~it~~, which  
is almost self-evident.

To overthrow the use of *secondary* prophe-  
cies, you must either suppose there was no ne-  
cessity that the Gospel doctrines should be pre-  
figured by the Law; or at least, that they  
should be prefigured in a covert and obscure  
manner.

The Bishop of *London* sometimes supposes  
there was a necessity that they should be pre-  
figured; but not in a covert and obscure  
manner. He supposes, therefore, *such a con-*  
*nexion* between the Law and the Gospel, as  
would supersede the use of all these figures.  
And yet he infers their expediency from this  
very *connexion*; as if the same circumstance  
could prove both their propriety and improp-  
riety at the same time.

Dr. *Warburton*, in order to justify the use  
of these figures, observes, 1<sup>st</sup>, That they are  
logical and rational: 2<sup>dly</sup>, That they were ex-  
pedient and useful under the Law. We have  
shewn that the principles, espoused by the  
learned Doctors, will oblige them to admit  
the *latter* proposition; and they are so far from  
denying the first, that they strenuously assert it.

Dr. *Middleton* often tells us; that the writ-  
ings of the ancient sages abound with *mystic*,  
K 3 *hidden*,

*bidden, allegoric senses; or deep, latent, and recondite meanings.* He says, "the Egyptians delivered all their sublimer parts of knowledge under the cover of symbols, types, and emblems<sup>1</sup>."

He observes from *Clement of Alexandria*, that "All writers, whether Barbarians or Greeks, who have ever treated of Theology, have industriously obscured the beginning and origin of things; by delivering the truth in ænigmas, symbols, allegories, metaphors, and such like figures."<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Sykes, alluding to the same passage, says; "the ancient sages covered over their opinions with *symbolical, or mystical, or allegorical veils*;" that they might not be manifest to all<sup>3</sup>.

Now these *ænigmas, mystical allegories, types and symbols*, intended for a *veil or cover*, must necessarily have involved the proposition in a *double sense*.

Thus, these two learned writers make no scruple to commend and applaud a mystical, typical, or allegorical veil, implying a *double sense* amongst the Pagan Sages; where we can, with difficulty, find a rational purpose; yet can by no means be brought to allow the an-

<sup>1</sup> Miscellaneous Tracts, p. 134, 151, 152.    <sup>2</sup> P. 191.

<sup>3</sup> Examination of the D. L. p. 89, 90.



cient Hebrew prophets the same privilege, tho' used for the plainest and most reasonable purpose. But suppose no advantages to be on the side of the Bible over profane writ; but that their different purposes were equally obscure or evident; is this just measure, to brand the same figures and modes of expression, as illogical and absurd in the Prophets; and yet, when found amongst the Sages of *Greece* and *Egypt*, to approve of them as scholastic and rational?

It has been observed, that Mr. *Collins* has himself thoroughly confuted his own fundamental principle; by shewing, that types, symbols, and allegories, which necessarily involve the proposition in a *double sense*, were the universal practice of antiquity<sup>m</sup>. And are not these learned Doctors involved in the same condemnation?

Mr. *Collins* affirms, that secondary prophecies are illogical and absurd; and yet affirms, that modes of information, of the same nature with, and perfectly equivalent to these, were used by the early Sages; and were the general practice of the ancient world. The learned Doctors accede heartily to each position; as if they made it their point of honour, not to depart in the least tittle from what the

<sup>m</sup> *D. L.* vol. II. p. 672, &c.



author of *The grounds and reasons* has advanced on this argument. It may seem surprising, that so sagacious and acute a writer as Mr. *Collins* should have fallen into this inconsistency: But what must we think of the sagacity of his learned seconds, who remained unconscious of it; after it had been exposed in so glaring and conspicuous a manner, as to make it obvious to every body else?

And here I must do the author of *The grounds and reasons* the justice to observe; that he has managed his argument (as generally the original users do) with far more dexterity and address, than either of his seconds. He objects, 1<sup>st</sup>, To the logical fitness and propriety of these figures. 2<sup>dly</sup>, To the expediency of them, as true Religion could have nothing to hide from any of its followers.---When driven from his first objection, he had it in his power to take refuge in the second; as he had the foresight to provide himself of a retreat. But his followers can take shelter in neither; ~~for~~<sup>as</sup> they have taken effectual care before-hand to remove and overthrow both.

Indeed it seems a little odd, that they could not prevail with themselves to espouse his system; 'till they had overset the arguments, on which the system is erected. In a word,  
Mr.

Mr. *Collins's* famous argument has met with a very singular and uncommon fate. The learned Prelate, who is always considered as one of the ablest writers against his argument; allows one of the two principles, on which he erects his system; and either of these is sufficient to put him in quiet possession of his argument. On the other hand, Dr. *Middleton* and Dr. *Sykes*, who scruple not to defend his argument; yet attempt to overthrow the two positions, which only can establish and support it. They would chuse, it seems, to take his system merely on his credit and authority; not only without *his reasons*, but also in direct opposition to *their own*.

But let us hear, what particular objections Dr. *Sykes* has to the notion of *types* and *secondary* prophecies.

He says, the facts and circumstances, supposed to be typical, "are never previously declared (in the Old Testament) to signify something future".

Now, an explanation, he says, must have been originally annexed; *on the supposition* that a type was intended. This is particularly unlucky: For the nature and use of a *type*, rather than of *plain* and *literal* expression, ne-

\* Essay on the Christian Religion, 2d edition, p. 207.

cessarily



cessarily implies the direct contrary to *explanation*; namely obscurity and concealment.

What therefore can be more absurd than to doubt the reality of a *type*, from the omission of a circumstance, which must have been omitted, on the supposition that a type was indeed employed. Is it not enough, that the facts and circumstances are represented in the very manner they must have been, if they were actually designed for typical representations!

According to the Doctor's reasoning, the type and its explanation must have gone together; *i. e.* the *rough draught*, or *imperfect delineation*, and a *fair and finished picture*, must have been represented together in the same table. And does not such a ridiculous conjunction, sufficiently discredit the folly of supposing, that the *explanation* should have been originally attached to the *type*?

The spiritual promises of the Gospel, are supposed to be the things typified. These, according to the Dr. were to remain a *mystery* in this age of the world; and consequently could not have been opened and explained, let them be as much the subject of the *types* as you please°.

Dr. Law has been already quoted, as asserting that types were appointed for a *cover*. But he sometimes speaks another language; and pretends that they were

Another



Another of his objections runs thus: "A  
 "double sense of prophecies, where the pro-

known in the time of the Law to be figurative of the  
 Messiah. *Considerations*, &c. p. 138.

Thus he gives two *contrary* accounts of these figures.  
 His *first*, as has been shown, will oblige him to suppose,  
 that a future state was secreted from the ancient *Jews*.  
 Let us now consider how he will support his *second* thought  
 against the objections of unbelievers.

He says the *Jews* "were taught to expect the Messiah  
 "by numberless preparatory types, and figures." (p. 138.)  
 The followers of Lord *Bolingbroke* deny, that the circum-  
 stances here alluded to, were intended to be *typical* or  
*prophetical*. The Dr. maintains, that they were originally  
 declared to be so; as they taught the *Jews* to expect  
 the *Messiah*. Who are his vouchers for this *original* de-  
 claration, say the unbelievers, for surely it is a point of  
 too much importance to be received on his bare autho-  
 rity; and yet we much suspect, he has nothing else to  
 produce for it.

If such declarations were made; why were they not re-  
 corded; as they must have been so many plain and clear  
 proofs of the mission of *Jesus*?

If the *types* of the Law were opened and explained, or  
 its temporal blessings were declared to be significative of  
 such as were spiritual and future; the doctrine of life and  
 immortality would have been clearly manifested at this  
 time. And then how could the author of the epistle to  
 the *Hebrews* say, that "it *begun* FIRST to be spoken by  
 "Jesus Christ?"

How could it have been so often styled a *mystery*; if it  
 was revealed in the typical sense of the Law?

How could the *Jews* have been all their life time sub-  
 jected to bondage through fear of death; if the spiritual  
 sense of the Law, and consequently the spiritual nature  
 and promises of the Gospel, had been explained to them?

On this supposition, how could they be said to sit in  
 darkness, and in the region and shadow of death?

“phet has not declared such a *double* sense,  
 “is making prophecy useless; because, when  
 “prophecies have no *one* determinate sense,  
 “they will be equally capable of as many ac-  
 “complishments as every *enthusiast* pleases °.”  
 From the abuse to the disuse. A stale sophism!

In short, how could the several passages, quoted out of the New Testament in the preceding chapter, have been delivered by inspired writers; if the typical sense of the Law, and consequently the great and leading principles of the Gospel, were opened to the ancient *Jews*? These are shrewd questions; which, when he has answered, there are others still behind.

Not to mention, what should have been first of all urged against him, that he is inconsistent with himself in supposing such a revelation. For he maintains, that the Law “\* afforded only a *dark, distant* intimation of better “things; and introduced these in figurative representa- “tions by sacrifices, *types* and *emblems*.”

If these *types* and *emblems* were declared to be figurative at all, they must have been declared to be figurative of spiritual and future blessings. These spiritual and future blessings therefore would have been not only *intimated* in a *dark* and *distant* manner, but revealed in *plain* and *express* terms. For a declaration that they were couched under these *figurative representations, types, and emblems*, would have been nothing less than a *plain* and *express* *revelation* of them.

Again, he says, that types were intended for a *carnal* COVER †. Now a *cover*, that was to be taken off, and removed, as soon as it had been laid on; would have been contrived for very little purpose.

If the temporal promises of the Law were declared to be significative of such as were spiritual and future; temporal promises would rather have been an *opening to*, than a *cover* of the spiritual.

• *Essay*, p. 182.

• P. 98.

† P. 225.

And



And this is all the answer his observation deserves. But let us do it full justice.

He pretends, that we shall never know where to stop; if we extend a prophecy to more senses than *one*. But the very argument assigned for *two* senses, limits and restrains us to this very number; and will not permit us to suppose *more*. The Law was to prefigure the Gospel in a covert and obscure manner. From thence we infer, that prophecies, predicting events under the one, may have a remote reference and relation to the other. Thus we make the Jewish dispensation the object of the *primary*, and the Gospel the object of the *secondary* sense. And as the argument confines the prophecy to two *subjects*, must it not necessarily confine it also to two *senses*?

Had the Law been given to prefigure a *third*, or *many* dispensations, as well as the Gospel; he might have some ground to ask, why we restrained a prophecy to *two* senses, and did not extend it to a *third*, or even to *many*? But till he has pointed out a *third*, or *many* dispensations, which were to be prefigured by the Law; he has certainly nothing to do but to withdraw his objection.

The relation between the Law and the Gospel, makes it reasonable to suppose; that  
the



the one should prefigure the other, in a covert and obscure manner. This relation therefore is the foundation of the *double sense*. And as it is peculiar to, or begins and ends with, the Gospel; must not the *secondary sense*, which results from it, be peculiar to, or begin and end with the Gospel also?

To support his objection, the Dr. should prove, that the Law has no peculiar relation to, or nothing more to do with, the Gospel, than with any other dispensation. And this indeed would be proving, what perhaps he may aim at, that it had nothing to do with the Gospel at all.

He thought, the *secondary sense* was founded on mere *fancy and imagination*; and consequently might be multiplied at pleasure. Had he seen, that it was supposed to be founded on the peculiar relation which the Law bears to the Gospel; he must have seen, that we are no more at liberty to multiply it, than to multiply this relation; by supposing, that the Law may as well relate to the Alcoran as to the Gospel.

It will seem strange, that after *thirty years* spent in considering, reviewing, and explaining this argument, he should not have discovered the foundation, on which the *secondary sense* is built. Especially as he was, at the same time,

time, very busy in supporting this undiscovered foundation, in his continued assertions, that the doctrines of the Gospel were to be prefigured, and yet concealed in the Law.

He pretends we shall never know where to stop; if we assign to a proposition, more senses than one. He has been bid to apply this goodly piece of criticism to the celebrated ode of *Horace*<sup>r</sup>, and to the lines of *Virgil*<sup>a</sup>; to both of which the author of the *D. L.* has assigned a *double sense*. If he says, they have only one meaning; he will hardly find himself supported by any, who have the least judgment or taste in criticism. If he says they may as well have *many* senses as *two*; he may still chance to be alone, since the reason assigned for *two* senses precludes the supposition of *more*. For, according to a very great writer<sup>r</sup>, and consummate judge of these matters; this reason is nothing else than the *relationship and dependency, which we find between the two senses in question*.

The Dr. supposes, that the writings of the ancient Sages had a plain and literal, and also

<sup>r</sup> O navis, referent in mare te novi  
Fluctus ! &c.

<sup>a</sup> Talia, per clypeum Vulcani, dona parentis  
Miratur; rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet.  
Attollens humero famamque et fata nepotum.

<sup>r</sup> Mr. Hurd's commentary on Horace, Vol. ii. p. 73.



a *mystical* or *symbolical* meaning. Here he allows two senses, and admits no more. Why is the interpreter of sacred Scripture denied the same liberty? But it is hard to hold him; and still harder to understand him. He often argues, as if the *plain* and *literal* sense must comprehend the *whole* meaning of a passage; or as if a proposition was, *in the nature of things*, capable of no more senses than one.

It is strange he should not be able to understand, after he has been so plainly and expressly informed; "that the sense of *propositions* is imposed as arbitrarily, as the sense of *words*. And therefore if men, in the communication of their thoughts, agree to give, on some occasions, a *double* sense to *propositions*, as well, as on others a *single*; the interpreting the first in *two* meanings is as agreeable to all *scholastic* rules, as interpreting the second in *one*".

The learned Dr. owns; that the ancient sages did thus actually agree to give a *double* sense to propositions, when they put their doctrines under a *mystical* or *symbolical* veil. Yet he undertakes to shew, *from reason*, that a proposition is capable only of *one* sense;

\* Preface to his paraphrase on the epistle to the Hebrews, p. 31.

† D. L. Vol. ii. p. 673.



after he has effectually proved from *fact* and *experience*, that it is capable of *two*: as if the most proper way to establish an hypothesis was to discredit it, by the contrary evidence of fact.

“ Words, says this learned Dr, which are  
 “ said to mean *two* persons at the same time,  
 “ may as well mean *two* and *twenty*: and no  
 “ one can say, *who* in particular is intended;  
 “ unless it had been said at first, that *two*,  
 “ and only *two* persons were designed; which,  
 “ I apprehend, is never said. And besides it  
 “ introduces such an *ambiguity*, such an *un-*  
 “ *certainty*, into the sacred writings; as no  
 “ books of even human composition are liable  
 “ to”. ”

It hath been shewn, that the *double* sense of Prophecy can relate only to *two subjects*, or to *two* different *events*, which are supposed to happen under *two* successive dispensations. It can extend therefore only to the *two* persons, by whom the events are accomplished.

We generally suppose, that the redemption of mankind is shadowed out in the secondary sense of some ancient Prophecies.

• Paraphrase on the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, p. 19.

L

And

And if we have precisely fixed and determined the *event*; how can there be any difficulty in fixing and determining the *person* with the same precision? Had we more authors of our salvation than *one*, or was the office of redemption distributed into *many* hands; we might be at a loss, where a Saviour or Redeemer is described, to ascertain the *person* meant. But as *one died for all*, and as there is but *one Lord, one faith, one baptism*; what is there to perplex us in the application of these prophecies? "

" "Prophecies of double senses (says Dr. *Jartin*) IF SUCH PROPHECIES THERE BE, may have meanings " as determinate and fixed, as if they had only one sense." *Remarks on Ecclesiastical History*, vol. i. p. 195.

It is pity but the author had pointed out the reasons, which shew that the ancient prophecies were capable of no more than two senses; as Dr. *Sykes's* late objections seem to be levelled at the particular types and secondary prophecies mentioned in the first volume of the *Remarks*. And indeed *some* of these are so circumstanced, that they will stand in need of no less able an advocate than the learned Doctor to vindicate from the other learned Doctor's objections.

But he seems to *doubt* and *question* the existence of secondary prophecies; when he says, "Prophecies of double senses, IF SUCH PROPHECIES THERE BE." One would not have thought he should chuse to bring into question the existence of secondary prophecies; while he so strenuously asserts that of types. Mr. *Whiston*, indeed, was for making this distinction; i. e. was for discarding secondary prophecies, and yet retaining types:

" No



"No one, says the Dr, can say *who* in particular is intended; *unless it had been said* "at first, that *two*, and only *two*, persons were designed."

No such previous declaration seems necessary, since the *two subjects*, or *two events*, necessarily limit and restrain the prophecy to *two persons*.

If the first be previously ascertained, what difficulty can there be in ascertaining the last?

and if the Dr. would see the vanity of this distinction fully exposed, I must refer him to the *D. L.* p. 634. Mr. Whiston was the more pardonable, as he did not see the analogy between these figures; but supposed them to be of *natures entirely different*. On the other hand, Dr. Fortin had learned from the *D. L.* the true nature and character of secondary prophecies; had borrowed \* and adopted the principal argument, on which they are established; and declared, that the great objection against them had no force; "since prophecies of double senses may have meanings as determinate and fixed, as if they had one sense only."

It is strange, then, he should *doubt* or *question* their existence in one line; and declare, in the very next, that the grand objection against them had no force.

He strongly asserts their logical propriety, and also their expediency and usefulness †; in order to cast a shade over the christian doctrines to be prefigured in the Old Testament. And did these considerations lead him to doubt the reality of such figures?

\* V. i. p. 194.

† V. i. p. 194, 195, 196:



But “ besides (says he) it introduces such  
 “ an *ambiguity*, such an *uncertainty*, into the  
 “ sacred writings; as no books, of even hu-  
 “ man composition, are liable to.”

This *ambiguity* and *uncertainty* are sup-  
 posed to arise from our not being able to de-  
 termine the *particular subject* and *person* pre-  
 dicted by the secondary sense. The objec-  
 tion therefore has been already answered.

Let the Dr. tell us, whence it comes, that  
 a *mystical* and *symbolical* cover would not  
 create the same *ambiguity* and *uncertainty* in  
 the writings of the ancient sages, as in those  
 of the Old Testament.

*Ambiguity* and *uncertainty* do not arise  
 from the supposition of *two* senses, but of  
*many*. Every reader will allow, that the ode  
 of Horace, mentioned before, is so far from  
 being obscured and perplexed; that it re-  
 ceives new light, dignity, and force from  
 the secondary sense. And why may it not  
 have as happy an effect in illustrating the  
 sacred, as the profane writers? Or why  
 should it be supposed to change its nature,  
 and to become fantastic and groundless; as  
 soon as *Jesus* and his Gospel are considered as  
 the subjects of it?

The

The objection, which imputes *ambiguity* and *uncertainty* to the *double sense* of prophecies, had been sufficiently obviated by the author of the *D. L.* "If, says this writer, "men, in the communication of their "thoughts, agree to give, on some occasions, "a *double sense* to *propositions*, as well as, on "others, a *single*, the interpreting the first in "two meanings is as agreeable to all *scholastic* "rules, as interpreting the second in *one* : "And propositions with a double and single "sense, are as easily *distinguishable* from each "other, *by the help of the context*; as words "with a *literal* and *figurative* meaning."

But to proceed. "It is, and must be "confessed (says Dr. Sykes) that in all *other* "writers, there is but one *literal* sense of the "words of any author."

*It is and must be confessed* — By whom? Sure not by any body, who has learned to read. Certainly not by any, who have read antiquity; or have so much as heard of the writings of *those* ancient sages, who delivered their doctrines under a *mystical* or *symbolical* cover.

The learned Doctor owns, that the *Jewish* prophecies were given both to *prefigure* and *conceal* the doctrines of the Gospel. Now by this concession he puts a wide difference between *these* and *other* writings; or makes a secondary sense very commodious and useful in the first, *whatever may be the case of other compositions.*

L 3

'Tis



'Tis strange he should contend, that the prophetic books were written with a view proper and peculiar to themselves, and yet should contend, that they must be exactly circumstanced like other writings, composed with a purpose and design entirely different.

But, to discredit and expose the notion of a secondary sense, he tells us, that persons of a lively fancy may pretend to find one, where nothing of that kind was intended.

And so, such a sense could be intended *nowhere*, because some persons have sought for it *everywhere*. There are no allegories in *Homer*, because *every part* of him has been allegorized by his commentators. There is no secondary sense in the famous ode of *Horace* (*O navis referent, &c.*) because there is none in the following lines of *Virgil*, quoted by the Dr.

*Hi motus animorum, atque hæc certamina tanta  
Pulveris ængui jactu composita quiescunt.*

These two lines were quoted by the learned Dr; and surely they were quoted by him for no other purpose, than to shew his happy talent at parody.

All he says, therefore, amounts only to this, that we are not to suppose a

\* Paraphrase on the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, p. 42.

\* These lines originally relate to a battle of the bees; and the Dr. observes, that they may be applied to the cure of the fever by bark. He would insinuate, that this secondary sense is as rational and proper, as that assigned to the ancient prophecies. To justify this insinuation, he must suppose that there is no more connexion between the O. and N. Testament, than between a battle of the bees and a fever: In other words, he must suppose that there is no connexion at all between the O. and N. Testament.



secondary sense; merely because words, originally denoting one thing, are capable of being applied to another, which had no sort of relation to the first. And who supposed any such thing? Or what is this to the instances produced in the *D. L.* where the two senses have a strict relationship and dependency, or are nearly connected in the views and interests of the writer? What is it to the double prophecies, where the subjects are strongly connected, and belong to two successive dispensations; whereof one was designed to prefigure the other, and to prefigure it in a covert and obscure manner?

The question is, whether we may reasonably look for a secondary sense in the first of these dispensations. Now in support of the negative, the *Dr.* observes, that we find no such sense in writings of quite *another* nature; such as had nothing to do with two Religions connected with one another, in both which the writers and the readers were intimately concerned.

His prejudices against these prophecies, seem to have arisen, in part, from the apprehension; that we shall never be able to establish a double meaning, without giving a loose to the extravagancies of fanatics, and permitting

them to invent new senses, as long as their imaginations will hold out. But this is a panic terror; since we have shewn, that the *two subjects* will necessarily restrain us to *two senses*.

His prejudices might, in part, arise from observing, that some passages in the Old Testament are applied to certain facts and circumstances in the New, by way of *accommodation* only; or as being applicable to the last as properly as to their *original* occasion. Now this accommodated sense may indeed be applied to as many similar events as you please; or to *two and twenty*, as he expresses it, as well as *two*. But are we to suppose, the *secondary* prophecies may be as loosely and variously applied; notwithstanding they relate only to *two* subjects? You may as well say, the natural relationship of *brother* is precarious and uncertain; because civil usage has applied that term to persons exercising the same profession, discharging the same office, or executing the same designs.

Thus I have examined the main arguments alledged by the learned Doctor to invalidate the existence of types and secondary prophecies.

phacies. It was not worth while to descend to every particular; as the present considerations, if pertinent and proper, will be sufficient to decide the point in question.



It was not worth while to defend  
 to every particular as the present could  
 be. **CHAP. III.**

*Containing some reflections on the Lord Bishop  
 of London's second Dissertation, or his expla-  
 nation and account of the book of JOB. In  
 which it is shewn, that a scrupulous adherence  
 to the common System concerning the nature  
 of the two Dispensations, has betrayed his  
 Lordship into much confusion, perplexity,  
 and embarrass.*

**H**ERE his Lordship undertakes to  
 make good three things; 1. That the  
 argument between Job and his  
 friends turns upon this point, *whether the  
 afflictions of this world are certain marks of  
 God's displeasure, and an indication of the  
 wickedness of those who suffer*<sup>b</sup>.

2. That the book is of very high anti-  
 quity; and was written long before the time  
 of Moses.

3. That the celebrated passage (*I know that  
 my Redeemer liveth, &c.*) in the xixth chapter,  
 relates to the resurrection.

<sup>a</sup> Considerations, p. 66, 67.  
<sup>b</sup> Pl. 239, 40.

Now there seems to be no natural connection between the three points here maintained. On the contrary, the first is a direct contradiction to the *third*; and even to the *second*, upon the principles of the common system. And, so circumstanced, the *second* is plainly inconsistent with the *third*; as well as the *first*. Consequently, we cannot admit the *third*, without rejecting the *first* and *second*.

The first point is, that the argument between *Job* and his friends turns upon this question, "Whether the afflictions of this world are a certain mark of God's displeasure, and an indication of the wickedness of those that suffer." *Job's* friends maintain the affirmative, and he asserts the negative. But if this were the point in dispute, all the difficulties and perplexities, in which we find them entangled and involved, would be perfectly cleared up by the third of his Lordship's articles; which is *Job's* mention of the resurrection. Accordingly, one of the warmest admirers of this dissertation owns; "that if the hinge of the controversy turns on this, whether or no, consistently with God's justice, good men could be afflicted in this life; this declaration in the nineteenth

" tenth

“teenth chapter ought to have finished the  
“debate.”

This *first* point is also inconsistent with the  
*second*, upon the principles of the common  
system. His Lordship supposes, that *Job's*  
friends consider the afflictions of this world  
as a certain mark of the divine displeasure;  
and an indication of the wickedness of those  
who suffer. But then his Lordship holds,  
“that they confined the exercise of providence  
“to the present scene, and looked no further;  
“but concluded that God would either inter-  
“pose to do justice here, or would not do it  
“at all<sup>d</sup>.” Now the common system, on  
the contrary, teaches; that the belief of a  
future state has always been deemed a neces-  
sary and essential part of revealed religion,  
and been a popular and common doctrine  
among the worshipers of the true God, *at all*  
*times and in all places*. This is the great  
objection, which the advocates of this system,  
oppose to the argument of the *Divine Le-*  
*gation*.

According to his Lordship's representation  
of the case, “*Job's* friends were not only  
strangers to the christian or revealed doctrine

Dr. Grey's Preface to the book of *Job*.

¶ P. 240, 243.

of



of a future state, but even to any notion of a future retribution; which they all along treat as a mere fiction, and limit the exercise of providence to the present scene. They hold it much more reasonable to think, that <sup>God</sup> he will do justice here; than that he will defer it to a future and distant time. Nay, they assert, that this doctrine of a future state was not only false and groundless; but even dangerous and destructive to the interests of religion.\*

Now to what age or country of the world will his Lordship refer us, for a set of men, who were worshipers of the true God, acquainted with several of his dispensations to mankind, and yet who held, that religion could only be supported and maintained upon the principle that God interposed to execute judgment and justice in the present life; looking

\* P. 240, 243, 245. "Add to this, says his Lordship, two other charges brought against *Job's* opinion by *Eliphaz*, — he calls his notion *unprofitable*, *speeches that can do no good*; nay, which are hurtful; for says he, *thou castest off fear, and restrainest prayer before God*; ch. xv. 4. His thought was plainly this; if once *Job* can persuade men, that God does not interpose to execute judgment in this life, but reserves all things to a distant, *far distant day* of visitation, when the heavens shall be no more; there will be an end of all fear of God, an end of *all prayer* and supplication to him."

upon

upon the doctrine of a future state, as not only false and groundless, but even dangerous and destructive to the interests of religion? It will be necessary for him to point out such a country and age; if he would reconcile these characters to nature and history, or vindicate the author of the work, in giving such a representation of ancient times, as he here ascribes to him.

I do not pretend to say, that his Lordship will be unable to do this; but must needs believe, that it can be only done on the ruin and subversion of his own system. For he must allow, that persons of this character, and habituated to this way of thinking, had been trained and educated under a religion, which had not the doctrine of a future state; and had also been accustomed to the exercise of such an extraordinary providence, as made this doctrine unnecessary?

His Lordship cannot pretend, that the doctrine of a future state has been a necessary and essential part of religion at all times; since he supposes that Job's friends were well acquainted with the nature and attributes of the one true God, and yet limited the exercise of his providence to the present scene.

If he sometimes argues on the contrary supposition, his argument must be inconsistent with his own concessions;

Let us proceed to the second point, the high antiquity of the book of *Job*. We have already shewn, that it contradicts the *first*, on the principles of the common system. However, at all adventures, it is glaringly inconsistent with the *third*; which assigns the doctrine of the resurrection, and a future state to the text in the nineteenth chapter. If this book was older than the *Law*, we may be certain it did not contain any clear and distinct revelation of this doctrine. For why need it have been hid and concealed under types in the Pentateuch, if it had been nakedly and openly exposed in other inspired writings; which were then in the hands of the Jewish people?

or directly contradict what he has advanced in this second dissertation.

He supposes, that *Job's* friends had lived under an extraordinary providence, administered with so much vigour and exactness; as to be a sufficient support and foundation for Religion, without the additional punishments and rewards of a future state. Here then (tho' by the way only) I would beg leave to urge an argument *ad hominem*, and ask, whether the extraordinary providence was not administered with as much vigour and exactness under the *Law*, as in the times referred to, and described, by *Job's* friends.

\* Dr. Grey, speaking of the principle of a future state, says; " From its being omitted in the *Pentateuch*, there was perhaps the more occasion for its being mentioned

It



It would give one a strange idea of the administration of Providence, to suppose that it intended to reveal and hide, or to open and cover, the same doctrine, at the same time.

There must have been something extremely singular in the make and complexion of the *Jewish* people; if they were qualified to bear the full knowledge of this doctrine, as it stood plainly and openly revealed in the *Book of Job*; and yet were able to receive nothing more than the *dark, typical, and ænigmatical*

“clearly *here*; i. e. in the book of *Job*.” (Answer to Dr. Warburton, *Prop. 2.*) It was not barely omitted in the *Pentateuch*; but secreted under the cover and veil of types. And could there be an occasion to mention it *clearly* in one book, because there was an occasion to secrete it in another?

“A *single mention* of it, says Dr. Grey, might have been enough in such a book as this; if, as a learned writer thinks, the doctrine of the resurrection was the ancient traditional interpretation of the *Abrahamic covenant*, constantly preserved and believed in some shape or other in the *Jewish church*.” P. 102.

A *single mention* of it in this or any other book would have been *too much*; if it was at that time to be secreted under the cover and veil of types.

Dr. Grey should be cautious how he builds on the authority of *this* learned writer\*; who seems to have abandoned his *first* opinion, by declaring that the matters, exhibited under types, were purposely and industriously concealed from the *Jewish church*.

\* Dr. Stebbing.

repre-

representations, which were given of it in the *Law*.

His Lordship tells us; that the light and evidence of prophecy always corresponds to the state and condition of the people, to whom it is given<sup>h</sup>. But is it easy to conceive; that such very *dark*, and such very *clear* revelations of a future state, as are recorded in the *Pentateuch*, and in the book of *Job*, should correspond to the state and condition of one and the same people?

But this is not the only circumstance inconsistent with the high antiquity of this book.

His Lordship tells us; that “ *Moses* was not at liberty, in writing the history of the fall, to introduce the devil openly, but was obliged to keep him always out of sight; because the *Jews* were not to know, that our first parents had been seduced by the artifice of this evil spirit<sup>i</sup>.” On the other side, he assures us; that the book of *Job* was more ancient than those of *Moses*; was written in opposition to the notion of two independent principles, and often describes and represents *Satan* as the author of the fall. But why all this *caution* and *reserve* in the book of *Genesis*; if the agency of the devil, in this business, had been

<sup>h</sup> Discourses on Prophecy, p. 140.

<sup>i</sup> P. 56.

previously opened and explained in the book of *Job*? Or how was it necessary, not to say possible, to conceal this circumstance in one book; while it was revealed to every body in another?

“ Had the history of man’s fall plainly introduced an *invisible evil-being*, to confound the works of God, and to be the author of *iniquity*; it might (says his Lordship) have given great countenance to this error of two principles<sup>1</sup>. ”

Such an *introduction* could give no *new additional countenance* to this error; if the *evil being* had been already introduced in the book of *Job*.

It could give no *countenance at all* to this error, if his Lordship’s account of the book of *Job* be true. “ We need not wonder to see so much concern in this book of *Job*, to maintain the supremacy of God, and to guard it against every false notion; for this was the *theme*, the *business* of the author<sup>m</sup>. ” Now, the *theme* and *business* of the book must have been poorly executed indeed; if *Moses*, when the *supremacy of God* was *maintained* against the devil, in the book of *Job*, a book in the hands of his people, should yet be apprehensive that the bare men-

<sup>1</sup> Discourses, p. 56.    <sup>m</sup> P. 213, 215, 216.



tion of this *evil being*, in the book of *Genesis*, should revive the *error of the two principles*.

“ The evidence arising from this book, [the  
“ book of *Job*] is in all respects considerable;  
“ and it is of great moment (says his Lordship)  
“ to see those great strokes of true Religion,  
“ and of God’s purpose from the beginning,  
“ with respect to the children of men, pre-  
“ served in an author, who cannot be char-  
“ ged with *Jewish* education or prejudices;  
“ but who was born in another country, of  
“ another family, and does not appear to have  
“ heard of *Moses* or his Law; and yet the se-  
“ cret of God was with him ”.

*Considerable* as this evidence may appear to his Lordship, it will involve him in great difficulties. For on his interpretation of *Job’s redeemer*, and his *crooked serpent*, the author of the book must have been a much greater Prophet than *Moses*; 1<sup>st</sup>, As he revealed the doctrine of a future state plainly and distinctly, while *Moses* delivered it under the cover and veil of types. 2<sup>dly</sup>, As he was authorized to mention the *crooked serpent*, the agent and instrument of the *fall*; and also was put in trust to obviate the difficulties arising from it; while the commission of *Moses* did not extend to this fact, because he was

not qualified to obviate the difficulties arising from it.

Unbelievers will say, the book of *Job* had been published to very little purpose; if so learned and eminent a person as *Moses* had read it, and yet was unable to surmount those difficulties which had been thoroughly canvassed, and entirely removed in the course of the dispute. They will add, that the *different manner* in which *these great strokes of Religion* are managed by these two writers; will oblige them either to reject the authority of *Moses*, or of the author of the book of *Job*. For that we demand too much of their complaisance, if we expect they should believe, that *Moses* was under a necessity of omitting a circumstance, and hiding a doctrine in his writings; which were plainly revealed in others, of equal authority, then extant.

His Lordship observes; that the author of the book of *Job* "knew nothing of *Moses* and

\* The contents and circumstances of the book of *Job* have been urged by the author of the *D. L.* as certain evidence, that it was written after the times of *Moses*.

One of these circumstances is a plain allusion to the religious dispensation of the *Law*, in which, punishment was denounced on the children for the transgressions of their parents. "He that speaketh flattery to his friends, "even the eyes of his children shall fail," xvii. 5. "God layeth up iniquity for his children;" xxi. 19. Now where did God ever declare, that he would use this particular mode of punishment; but in the *Jewish Law*?

"his

“ his Law °.” On the other hand, his Lordship’s own notion will rather induce him to

In another place, *Job* says, “ That idolatry was an iniquity to be punished by the judges,” xxxi. 28. And where was idolatry ever punished by the magistrate, but under the *Jewish* œconomy?

The excellent Mr. *Locke* was so struck with this last circumstance, that he pronounced it decisive of the question; or a clear and unanswerable argument, that the book was written after the giving of the Law. (See his Letters on *Toleration*.)

Now since my Lord Bishop contends, that there is not in the book of *Job*, so much as one distant allusion to any part of the Law; it will be incumbent on him to point out some other system revealed by God, which threatened that children should suffer for the crimes of their parents; and that idolatry should be punished by the civil magistrate. For these are not the doctrines of *natural Religion*.

His Lordship has a follower, even in this; and indeed in what has he not a follower? the rev. Mr. *Lowth* repeats his words, of no distant allusion to any part of the Law \*. But he gives us no more satisfaction, on the difficulty proposed above; for it is much easier to follow his Lordship, than to confute *Locke*.

The learned Mr. *Heath* of *Exeter*, not content with a slight and superficial survey, has examined the book closely; and, on searching to the bottom of the question, has observed many allusions; which are far from being remote or distant. But I chose principally to insist on the two circumstances here mentioned; as my curiosity would be highly gratified, by the discovery of a religious and civil constitution, out of *Judea*, which declared that the children should suffer for the crimes of their parents; and that idolaters should be punished by the civil magistrate.

\* *Morum, rituum, rerum Israelitarum nulla vestigia, nullam speciem aut umbram video. De sacra Poesi Hebraeorum, p. 312.*



hold, that *Moses* had never seen the book of *Job*.

The third point much insisted on by the learned Prelate, is; that the celebrated text in the nineteenth chapter, relates to the doctrine of the resurrection and a future state.

“ He says, these words are a strong *prophecy* of the character and office of *Jesus Christ*,” or “ a plain prophetic description of the *grand article* of the Gospel.”

Now the objections, which seem to lie against this interpretation, are these.

Should we admit the *third* point, it would oblige us to give up the *first*; which supposes the matter in dispute between *Job* and his friends to be, “ Whether the afflictions of this world are a certain mark of the divine displeasure, and an indication of the wickedness of those who suffer.” *Job*’s friends maintain the affirmative; and insist, that calamities cannot befall the righteous, without impinging on the justice of God. On the other side, *Job* says, they are consistent with the divine attributes; and, in order to support his opinion, appeals to a *future state*. Now this doctrine effectually served to clear

up all the embarras. “ If therefore his friends  
 “ thought it true, it ended the dispute: if  
 “ they thought it false, it lay upon them to  
 “ confute it: yet they do neither. They nei-  
 “ ther call it into question, nor allow it to be  
 “ decisive. But, without the least notice  
 “ that any such thing had been urged, they  
 “ go on, as they began, to inforce their for-  
 “ mer arguments, and to confute that which  
 “ they seemed to understand to be the only  
 “ one which *Job* urged against them; viz. the  
 “ consciousness of his own innocence <sup>1</sup>.”

His Lordship seems to have been aware, that  
 some such difficulty might be raised against  
 his exposition of certain texts in this book;  
 and therefore endeavours to obviate it in the  
 following manner. “ But still there is some-  
 “ thing that seems very unaccountable in this  
 “ matter: For, if *Job*’s friends allowed and  
 “ believed this truth of a future resurrection,  
 “ how is it that they continue to press their ar-  
 “ gument; and to insist that he was undoubt-  
 “ edly *wicked*, because *miserable*? How is it  
 “ that they do not reply to this argument,  
 “ and shew the reasoning to be false, if they  
 “ apprehended it to be so? Or, if this know-  
 “ ledge was *peculiar* to *Job*, how is it, that

<sup>1</sup> D. L. vol. ii. p. 546.

“ they are not surprized at such *new*, such  
 “ *strange doctrine* ? ”

Accordingly he observes, that they reproach  
*Job* with his pretence to secret knowledge  
 above others, in consequence of his asserting  
 the doctrine of the resurrection and a future  
 state. “ They appear quite astonished,  
 “ and ask *Job*, where he had *this knowledge*;  
 “ whether he had *the secret* of God, and had  
 “ engrossed all wisdom to *himself* ? ”

Here his Lordship seems conscious of the  
 difficulty of evading the objection urged in the  
*D. L.*, without renouncing the common sy-  
 stem; which supposes the resurrection <sup>in a future state</sup> to be  
 the common doctrine of the world, and as  
 well known to the three friends, as to *Job*  
 himself: For he holds, that it was peculiar to  
*Job*, and unknown to his friends; nay, he  
 goes so far as to affirm; that the generality of  
 the faithful, in the age of *Job*, not only disbe-  
 lieved the principle; but even held it to be  
 subversive of all Religion.

However, he has not proved what he  
 here supposes; the *astonishment* of *Job*'s three  
 friends. They do indeed reproach him with  
 pretending to be wiser than all men; or with  
 engrossing wisdom, and arrogating *the secret*  
*of God* to *himself*. But that this reproach was

! P. 238, 239.

! P. 241 to 245.

in



in consequence of his asserting the notion of a future state, seems a precarious, uncertain, and arbitrary supposition; which receives no force or countenance from the context, or from the natural and obvious import of the words themselves. [p. 371]

Again: If *Job* speaks of a *resurrection* in the nineteenth chapter, whence comes it, that no notice is taken of this doctrine in the remaining part of the book?

His friends reply to what he had advanced in that chapter. After this he resumes the dispute against them; but insists no more on this supposed topic of a *future state*. Hence it seems probable, that he did not insist upon it at all. For otherwise, he could not have failed to inculcate and enforce it, when he resumed the debate. Had his friends taken no notice of it, it would have been natural for him to triumph and glory in their silence; and to reproach them with their inability to answer him. If they denied or derided it, it would have been *necessary* for him to remove their objections, or their scorn; and to expose the emptiness and futility of their cavils.

Had there been neither of these occasions, yet a second mention of so decisive an argument had been very natural in a debate, where  
the

the disputants so often resume their several topics, and leading principles.

But it is remarkable, “ that *Job*, when he  
 “ resumes the debate, sticks to the argument  
 “ he first set out with; and, though he found  
 “ it gave them little satisfaction, he repeats it  
 “ again and again. And this was, that the  
 “ sufferings of the righteous were consistent  
 “ with the divine attributes. *For that reason*  
 “ *must submit, and own God's ways to be in-*  
 “ *scrutable.* Now could he possibly rest in  
 “ this solution, how pious soever, if he had  
 “ the *more satisfactory* one of a future state?”  
 Or, had he *before* had recourse to this latter so-  
 lution, is it possible to conceive, that he would  
 chuse to abandon an argument, so extremely  
 pertinent, and decisive of the matter in question;  
 and take refuge in another, which does not  
 in the least silence or remove the difficulty?

“ But, what is strangest of all, when the two  
 “ parties had quite confounded themselves, and  
 “ one another; for want, as one would think,  
 “ of this principle of a *resurrection*, which so  
 “ easily unravels all the perplexities of the dis-  
 “ pute; the *fourth friend*, the moderator steps  
 “ in, as the *precursor* of the Almighty, the  
 “ great decider of the controversy. Here then  
 “ we might reasonably think, that the honour

“ of the solution, which the doctrine of the  
 “ *resurrection* affords, was reserved for these;  
 “ but, to our great surprize, they neither of  
 “ them give the least hint concerning it.”

According to the learned Prelate, this principle, during the debate, had been often questioned and denied by *Job's* friends; and barely asserted by himself. *Now in these circumstances*, what could have been more reasonable and proper to support its truth; than the declaration of the moderator and decider? The sanction of the *most authoritative* speakers seems to have been necessary to add weight and credit to a principle of this importance; especially after it had been so *boldly denied*, and so *freely ridiculed*, in the preceding part of the debate.

My Lord Bishop has greatly weakened his own interpretation, and added irrefragable force to that of the author of the *D. L.*; by supposing that the doctrine had been thus handled. For if it had been formally denied by his friends, it would have been incumbent on *Job* to re-assert and establish it on proper authority; or, if *he* had failed to do this, the *moderator* or *decider* must necessarily have done it for him.

Some of the most circumspect of his Lordship's advocates seem to be conscious that he

“ *D. L.* v. ii. p. 548.

has



has defeated his own purpose, and overthrown his exposition of this celebrated text; by maintaining the principal point in debate between *Job* and his friends to be, *whether the sufferings of the righteous in the present life are a reflection on the justice and goodness of God.*

“ If the hinge of the controversy (says the learned Dr. Grey) turned on this, whether or no, consistently with God’s justice, good men could be afflicted in this life, THIS DECLARATION OUGHT TO HAVE FINISHED THE DEBATE.” That he may support therefore the orthodox interpretation, he tells us, “ that the personal integrity of *Job*, and not the question concerning an equal or an unequal providence, was the principal subject of the book.” Thus he found himself obliged to give up the Bishop’s *first* point; that he might be enabled to support his *third*. A plain proof, that he was conscious of the *inconsistency* between them.

To proceed. It has been shewn, that this interpretation is destructive of *types* and *secondary prophecies*; as there could be no occasion for *Moses* and the *Prophets*, to throw a veil over a doctrine, which was plainly revealed in the book of *Job*.

Thus his Lordship seems to give up those very points in the appendix, which, in the

“ Preface to the book of *Job*.

body

body of his *discourses*, he undertook to defend against the author of *The grounds and reasons*.

He gives up, likewise, in consequence of this exposition, the several Prophecies which represent the *spiritual* nature and promises of the Gospel under *carnal* images and emblems; as well as those which relate to the temporal affairs of the Jewish nation. For he contends, in the body of his book, that Prophecies of *this sort* were only seasonable and expedient before the promise of life and immortality was plainly revealed; that is, *before the publication of the book of Job*.

This, too, as strange as it may appear, will, indeed, oblige his Lordship to give up the long series of miracles, and divine interpositions recorded in the writings of *Moses* and the *Prophets*. For he supposes, that such a dispensation of things was only necessary; while the better hopes of the GOSPEL were not brought in. If therefore these hopes were plainly delivered in the book of *Job*, such a dispensation could not, upon his Lordship's own principles, have been necessary under the LAW \*.

If the *Jews* were ripe for such a clear and distinct revelation of the great article of the final and ultimate religion; what occasion

\* See chapter V.

could

could there be to keep them under the *beggarly elements* and rudiments of the Law?

If there was occasion to keep them tied down to these elements, would not such a previous information have been premature; as it would have disposed them to look down upon the Law with contempt and disgust?

As his Lordship supposes, that this text contains a more plain and distinct revelation of the great mystery of the Gospel, than is to be found in the writings of *Moses* and the *Prophets*; it will follow, that the *Arabians*, and not the *Israelites*, were the *depositaries* of the *divine oracles*; contrary to the assertion, of *St. Paul*, as it is explained by his Lordship himself: "The great article of the  
" covenant, limited to *Abraham* and his  
" chosen seed, most evidently regarded the  
" whole race of man; and was to grow, in  
" the fullness of time, into a blessing upon all  
" the nations of the earth: He and his Pos-  
" terity were depositaries of these hopes; or,  
" to use the words of *St. Paul*, this was the  
" *Jews* chief advantage above others, that  
" unto them were committed the oracles of  
" God."

<sup>1</sup> See this argument explained at large in the next chapter.

<sup>2</sup> *Discourses on prophecy*, p. 126.

Accord-



According to his Lordship's interpretation of the text, these divine oracles were committed to the *Arabians* more clearly and fully in the book of *Job*, than to the *Israelites* in the writings of *Moses* and the *Prophets*. For they were delivered to the latter, under the cover and veil of types; but plainly and distinctly to the former, in all the lustre of christian knowledge.

The *Jews* were so far from having any advantage over the *Arabians* in this matter, in being considered as the depositaries of the divine oracles; that, on the other hand, the religious situation of the *Arabians*, was far more eligible than that of the chosen seed of *Abraham*. For they had the same hope of life and immortality, upon more gentle and easy terms; and unencumbered with the load of so multifarious and minute a ritual, as that prescribed by the Law of *Moses*.

The *Israelites* would soon have shook-off their subjection to the Law, had they known that the descendents of *Ismael*, notwithstanding the curse pronounced upon them, were favoured with a clearer revelation of life and immortality than was given by *Moses* and the prophets; and were also intitled to this blessing on more easy and commodious conditions  
than

than themselves, *the chosen seed*, descended from *Isaac*.

“ It is strange to me (says his Lordship)  
 “ to observe what stress the very learned  
 “ *Grotius* lays upon the consent of the  
 “ *Jewish* interpretations in this case: They  
 “ are, says he, *inquisitive after every thing*  
 “ *that may with any appearance be applied*  
 “ *to the resurrection; but this passage they*  
 “ *never so apply.* And reason good: The  
 “ *Jews* without doubt would be glad to  
 “ find in their own Law whatever appears  
 “ to them to be excellent in the Gospel; that  
 “ they may shew the little need there was of  
 “ the Gospel revelation. But would they be  
 “ equally glad to find *clearer knowledge of*  
 “ *divine truth amongst the ancient Arabians,*  
 “ *than among the descendants of Abraham* \*?”

This is owning to some purpose, THAT THE ARABIANS HAD A CLEARER REVELATION OF THE DIVINE WILL, THAN THE CHOSEN SEED OF ABRAHAM. But then, How was this superior grace to the descendants of *Ismael* consistent with the advantage which the sacred scriptures assure us the *Israelites* had above all other nations, in the knowledge of religious matters?

It was not agreeable to his Lordship's usual candour, to brand and reproach the *Jews*,

\* P. 228.

for being unwilling to own, that the *Ardians* had a clearer knowledge of the divine oracles than themselves. This was a laudable and honest prejudice, as it was established on the authority of Revelation; and was only asserting the prerogative, with which God honoured and distinguished his *favourite* and *chosen* People.

We see then his Lordship gives a good reason, why the *Jews* dissented from his interpretation of this text. And we see too, what his Lordship seems not to have been aware of, that they were justified in their dissent by the necessity they were under of preserving Scripture consistent with itself. And what justified them, will, I presume, excuse us, in not acceding to his Lordship's interpretation.

<sup>old and</sup> Many passages and circumstances in the New Testament create a strong prejudice against his Lordship's interpretation of this text. If *David* saw the doctrine of the resurrection plainly revealed in the book of *Job*, how could he have spoken in the manner he has done in the several passages quoted in the *first* chapter of this work? How could he have said, "Wilt thou shew *wonders* to the dead? Shall the dead *ARISE*, and praise thee?"



The advocates for the common interpretation might here reproach the dull and short sighted prophet, (as they do those who build upon him;) and ask, how he could doubt the certainty and reality of a fact; which had been so precisely and circumstantially affirmed in the book of *Job*?

If the prosperity of the wicked, and the sufferings of the righteous in the present life, are clearly solved in this book *upon the principle of a future state*; whence comes it, that the prophet *Jeremiah* was, *after the most grave and serious deliberation*, utterly unable to account for this inequality? “Righteous art thou, O Lord, when I plead with thee, yet let me talk with thee of thy judgments; *Wherefore doth the way of the wicked prosper? Wherefore are all they happy that deal very treacherously?*” (xii. 1.) It is hardly possible, that he should have been thus embarrassed; if the answer lay before his eyes in the book of *Job*, and was there applied to the solution of this very difficulty?

*Ezekiel* was carried by the Spirit into a valley full of dry bones; and asked this question, *Son of man, can these dry bones live?* Would God have proposed such a

*Ezek. xxxvii. 3.*

question,

question to a prophet brought-up in the knowledge and belief of the resurrection? or would not *Ezekiel* have answered Yes, without hesitation; if he had seen the doctrine revealed in these words, *Though after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God*; which teach, that *dry bones* were to be restored to life? And yet he was confounded and surprised at the strangeness of the demand<sup>b</sup>.

Thus *David*, *Jeremiah*, and *Ezekiel*, seem to have profited but little by this text in the book of *Job*; since they were as much embarrassed with the circumstance of the inequality, as if they had never seen any plain description of this Gospel-article. [p. 378]

Of the many passages produced, in our first chapter, from the New Testament, which might be employed to the ruin of my Lord Bishop's exposition; I shall here select a few,

<sup>b</sup> This passage is often produced to prove, that the *Jews* had the knowledge of the resurrection. It might have been alledged with more plausibility, tho' not with much more pertinence, (for it has nothing to do with a resurrection) had the words run thus in the affirmative, "These dry bones shall live." But they are put *by way of interrogation*; and neither the question proposed, nor the answer given, will allow us to suppose that the doctrine of the resurrection was known at that time.

and leave the advocates of the common system to apply the rest at their leisure.

His Lordship maintains, that these words of Job are “ a *strong prophecy* of the character “ and office of *Jesus Christ*,” or “ a *plain prophetic description* of the *grand article* “ of the Gospel.”

If the grand article of the Gospel was clearly revealed to the *Jews* in the book of *Job*; how could they be said to *sit in the region and shadow of death*; or to have been “ all their life time *through fear of death* subject to bondage?”

On this supposition how could the author of the epistle to the *Hebrews* affirm, that *the way to heaven was not made manifest under the Law* — that *the better hopes of the Gospel were brought in AFTERWARDS* — and that *the good tidings of salvation* *BEGAN FIRST to be spoken by Jesus Christ*?

According to my Lord Bishop's interpretation, the way to heaven had been made manifest, and the better hopes of the Gospel had been brought in, long before the giving of the Law; and Jesus Christ was so far from being the *first*, that he was one of the *later* teachers of this doctrine.



St. Paul tells us, that the principle of justification by faith in *Jesus Christ* was not revealed to the *Jewish* church<sup>d</sup>. And yet my Lord Bishop assures us, that this very principle, or *the grand article of the Gospel*, was *strongly* foretold, and *plainly* revealed to the *Arabians* and *Jews*, in the book of *Job*.

In his epistle to *Titus*, he says; God's purpose of restoring mankind to life and immortality, "was manifested in *due time*," or in that particular age of the world. But, according to his Lordship, the *due time* of revealing this mystery was in the age of *Job*; or even before this period.

The apostle likewise tells us, that Moses and the Prophets were only Ministers of *the letter that killeth*; and not of *the spirit which giveth life*. But can we imagine, that they would have been limited to *the letter*; if *the spirit* of the Law had been at that time opened and unfolded, in the book of *Job*? If the redemption of mankind by the Son of God was so clearly manifested in the book of *Job*, how could St. Paul so often style it *a mystery*?

What *mystery* could there be, to *hide from ages and generations*; if the salvation of the whole race of mankind, both *Jews* and Gen-

<sup>d</sup> *Romans*, iii. 21, 22. *Galatians*, iii. 23.

*tiles*, had been all along clearly revealed to the *Arabians* and *Jews* in the book of *Job*?

My Lord Bishop to establish his interpretation, must contrive to explain away these several authorities and facts, produced from the Old and New Testament. For whatever he may be pleased to say of a *plain prophetical description* of the doctrine of the resurrection; the passages alledged above, will be sufficient to convince every candid and attentive reader, that *David*, *Jeremiab*, *Ezekiel*, and *St. Paul*, did *not* understand the text in question, in the same sense with his Lordship.

But, further, permit me to observe, as a matter of the utmost consequence; that his Lordship's exposition of this text would undermine his whole scheme concerning the *gradual order and progression* of the ancient prophecies.

He supposes, that these words are "a strong  
" prophecy of the character and office of  
" *Jesus Christ*;" or "a *plain prophetical de*  
" scription of the *grand article* of the Gos-  
" pel."

But he is so candid and equitable withal, as to confess, that these words thus interpreted, afford "a *clearer*, and *more distinct*

\* Discourses on prophecy, p. 227, 228.

" knowledge

“ knowledge of this great mystery, than  
 “ God thought fit to reveal to the *Jewish*  
 “ church <sup>f</sup>.”

The consequence of these two assertions is, that his Lordship must suppose this *grand article* was more plainly and distinctly revealed to the faithful before the Law, than to those who lived under it; or that the Prophecies concerning the redemption of mankind, which had been given before this period, were far more plain, open, and explicit, than those which succeeded them. And yet such a supposition is directly repugnant to his main system; and will oblige him even to invert the order which he has assigned to the ancient Prophecies. For he holds, that the scheme of our redemption was a mystery opened and unfolded gradually in a long order and chain of Prophecies, so circumstanced, that the successive ones are supposed to throw additional light and evidence on those which went before; or to contain more full, exact, and perfect descriptions of the *grand article*, which was the common subject of them all.

Here then, I say, it unluckily happens; that this notion of the gradual order and progression of prophecy is entirely overthrown by his Lordship's own account of this text, which

[ P. 227, 228.

N 4

supposes



supposes that the Prophecies, given in the age of *Job*, describe this mystery more plainly and exactly, than those of Moses and the Prophets under the *Law*. He must therefore no longer say, that this mystery was gradually opened and displayed; but rather that it was gradually *darkened* and *obscured* by the prophecies of this *later* period. For it was plainly revealed, in the age of *Job*; and wrapped up under dark, mystical, and enigmatical representations, in the time of Moses and the Prophets. Thus the Law would have been given to cloud and eclipse the preceding Revelations, or to stifle and extinguish the radiance of that light which shone forth so brightly under the patriarchal Dispensation.

We have often urged the typical and secondary prophecies, relating to redemption and a future state, as subversive of the common system: For that the very mode of information implies, that the doctrines conveyed under them were not openly revealed at this time. The same prophecies, if considered as part or links of a gradual and progressive chain, will enable us to make the same conclusion: For typical and secondary prophecies, in the natural order and course of things, could not be preceded by primary, literal, and direct ones. Therefore no primary, literal, and direct

direct revelations (I mean such as were communicated to the body of the faithful) of a future state were made before the Law.

There are other prophecies, which represent the spiritual nature and promises of the Gospel under temporal and carnal images. These too I have urged as destructive of the common system; since they imply, that the spiritual nature and promises of the Gospel were not clearly revealed at that time. These also, if considered as parts and links of a gradual and progressive chain, will equally tend to the ruin and subversion of his Lordship's system. For the natural order and progression of the chain will not permit us to suppose, that such obscure and highly figurative prophecies could be posterior to, or even coeval with, any plain, literal, and direct ones.

His Lordship thinks it no improbable supposition, " that the few faithful in the time  
" of *Job* might have the doctrine contained  
" in this passage as a traditionary exposition  
" of the promises of God, grounded upon  
" more express revelations, *made either before,*  
" *or soon after the flood,* than have come  
" down to our times <sup>5</sup>."

\* Discourses on Prophecy, p. 238.

It

It is strange his Lordship should not perceive, that the supposition of such *plain* and *early* revelations breaks in upon the order, and destroys the uniformity of his system. For this is assigning more clear, perfect, and distinct revelations of this mystery, to the *first ages of the world*; than to the *Jewish church* under the *Law*. And what can be more inconsistent, than to suppose; that the first and higher links of the chain conveyed greater degrees of light and knowledge, than many of the later and lower; while, at the same time, it is supposed that the general subject of them all was opened and unfolded *gradually*?

If this Mystery had been clearly revealed about the time of the Flood, there could have been no occasion for a long chain of prophecies *afterwards*, to discover and open it gradually and by parts. In the nature and reason of the thing, we never can imagine, that an order of partial, inadequate, and defective revelations could be seasonable and proper; if the common subject of them all had been completely revealed before. Whenever this was done, the chain must of course fall in pieces. Job must have had his hand on the *last* link, as we can look for nothing farther in the natural order and progression of things, than  
*a plain*



a plain prophetic description of the grand article of the Gospel.

His Lordship contends for a long chain of prophecies, given almost from the beginning of the world, and ending with the later Jewish prophets. Dr. Middleton treats this as a fanciful and romantic scheme; and pretends, that no prophecies, relating to the *Messiah*, were given before the time of *Moses*<sup>b</sup>. But it seems, he has mistaken one end of this famous CHAIN for the other end. He should not have said, it did not begin so soon; but that it ended much sooner, than the period assigned by his learned adversary. For if the whole matter of the chain was composed at the time of the flood, there it must have ended; and not a link more could be added to it.

The extent of the chain therefore is shortened as well by my Lord Bishop, as by his antagonist. The only difference is, that they begin their work at the two opposite ends. The hypothesis of the learned Prelate takes away many of the lower, and the criticism of the learned Doctor cuts off most of the upper links of the chain.

His Lordship informs us; that the great purpose of his treatise, "was to shew the use

<sup>b</sup> Examination of the Bishop of London's Discourses.

“and *intent* of Prophecy in the *several ages*  
 “of the world, and the manifest *connexion*  
 “between the Prophecies of *every age*.”

But the supposition of a plain and distinct prediction of the Gospel about the time of the flood, or let it be in the age of *Job*, is so far from tending to make this connexion strong and *manifest*; that it plainly weakens and obscures it. For how could the following Prophecies be *properly connected* with these; if they poured no additional light on the general subject, but rather clouded and obscured it?

I should likewise be glad to know; how the dark, typical, and secondary prophecies under the Law could be *properly connected* with the primary, literal, and direct ones, delivered to *Job*, or long before his time. For as I apprehend the nature of this connexion, it is made by an accession of new light in *later* Prophecies, reflected back on the obscurities of the *earlier*; in such a manner as to clear up their doubtfulness and ambiguities, and to shew, that they had both, but one and the same object.

His Lordship contends for a long train of Prophecies, which are supposed to succeed each other in a natural and regular gradation; pointing out the office of the *Messiah* more and

<sup>i</sup> See his preface.

more

more plainly, the nearer you come to the bottom of the chain. But when he comes to explain the particular Prophecies belonging to this chain, he seems to confound the higher and the lower links together; without any regard to that gradual order and connexion, which he had before assigned to them.

In one place his Lordship reckons up the principal circumstances, *which were reserved to be revealed by the later Prophets*; or were intended to close and shut up the scene of Prophecy. Among these he ranks *the promise of a new and better covenant, the great works, the glories and sufferings of the Messiah*<sup>k</sup>.

In the same discourse, he endeavours to prove, that a new Covenant was promised by Moses at the very first establishment of the Law<sup>l</sup>. By which means, he makes the higher links of the chain, under the Jewish economy, perfectly like the lowest, at the propagation of the Gospel; since the *spiritual* covenant, on this system, was as clearly promised by Moses, as it was made by Jesus.

His Lordship likewise entirely neglects and overlooks the gradual order and connexion of his chain; while he insists, that the *spiritual* covenant was more distinctly revealed in the

<sup>k</sup> Discourses on Prophecy, p. 151.

<sup>l</sup> P. 165, &c.



book of *Job*, and in the age near the Flood, than in the Prophecies delivered to the Jewish church.

Nay, he even ventures to say, that the *spiritual* covenant was plainly foretold in the original Prophecy; which declares, that *the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head*<sup>m</sup>: which is making the very first link of the chain as bright and resplendent as the last.

“ Now (*i. e.* in the age of the *later* Prophets) was it, (says his Lordship) that God taught his people *plainly* to expect a new covenant, a better than that made with their Fathers<sup>n</sup>.”

But why does he say, *now*; when, on his own principles, they had all along been *plainly* taught to expect this Covenant; even from the time of the first and original Prophecy.

The *great works* and the *glories*, his Lordship speaks of, were the redemption of mankind, and Christ's spiritual kingdom in heaven. But, according to his own principles, these very points had been more plainly delivered in the book of *Job*, and in certain Prophecies about the time of the Flood; than in the *latest* of those which were given to the Jewish church. These then, were so far from being reserved for the *last*, that they were inculcated

<sup>m</sup> Discourse iii.

<sup>n</sup> P. 151.

by the *first* Prophets. And thus the order of the chain become evidently inverted; the more early revelations being more explicit and distinct than those which succeeded them.

The next point is *the sufferings of Christ*. His Lordship affirms, that the rite of *sacrifice* was originally appointed by God; and that it was *one kind of Prophecy*, or representation of the great sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the world. Thus, the *first* Prophecy informed men, that they were to expect a REDEEMER. The *second* taught them, that he was to procure this REDEMPTION by his death and sufferings.

Again, his Lordship disturbs and interrupts the order of the chain; by supposing the sacrifice of our Redeemer was as plainly fore-shewn in the *second* link, as in the *last*.

According to the natural order and gradation of this chain, one would imagine, that the most considerable and important branches of the Gospel dispensation, had been reserved to be revealed by the *later* Prophets. But, when his Lordship comes to reckon up particulars, he mentions "the plain promise of a new Covenant; the great works, the glories, and the sufferings of *Christ*, to-

“ gether with the *time* and *place* of his birth.” Now, according to his Lordship’s system, all these circumstances, except the *two last*, had been plainly revealed long before. And these two, tho’ articles of some consequence, are far less considerable than the others. Thus, the most important articles of the Gospel, were delivered in the *first* Prophecies; while those of less moment were reserved to be revealed in the *last*. A position, which might have been consistently maintained by the learned Prelate; had the principles of his hypothesis been just reversed.

According to his system, the promise of redemption and a future state, was plainly revealed to the body of the faithful in the ages preceding the Law. But it was afterwards delivered under the cover and veil of types, during the course of the *Mosaic* dispensation. And, lastly, it was again clearly opened and revealed by *Jesus Christ* in the Gospel.

It was revealed therefore in the first and third period; and secreted under the second. So that the Law did not tend to continue and preserve, but to disturb and violate the order and progression of these religious Dispensations.



This learned Prelate often considers the Law as a preparatory or introductory system to the final and ultimate Religion of the Gospel. How then can he suppose, that the grand and primary article of the Gospel was revealed in the book of Job? Is it of the nature of a preparatory and introductory system to succeed that which is final and ultimate?

"It is foretold, (says his Lordship) that Christ should be a man of sorrow, and affliction; that his affliction should pursue him even to the grave; and it is also foretold, that notwithstanding these sufferings, and a wretched death, he should prolong his days, and have an everlasting kingdom, and see the work of the Lord prosper in his hands. These prophecies are not at all plainer now, than they were in the beginning. But the plain sense appeared at that time loaded with contradictions."

Now if this be true, that the Prophecies, which predicted the death and sufferings of Christ, would make the preceding ones, which assign him an everlasting kingdom, perfectly unintelligible to the Jewish church, it is as certain, that some of the later Prophecies, delivered by Israel, must have ob-

scured and perplexed the more early ones given to *David*, which promised an everlasting kingdom to one of his seed. And thus the late Prophecies, instead of adding light and lustre to the former, according to one of his Lordship's opinions; would cast a shade and veil over them, according to another.

His Lordship supposes, that the former Prophecies were given to *raise, cherish, and encourage* the hopes and expectations of this everlasting kingdom; and yet he supposes, that the latter would damp these hopes and expectations by predicting some circumstances which the *Jews* could not reconcile to the notion of such a kingdom. Thus the last Prophecies, in great measure, were to undo the business of the first; by discouraging the hopes and expectations which had been raised by them.

Hitherto I have argued on the supposition that the Prophecies which speak of the death and sufferings of *Christ*, were *posterior* to those which speak of him as a temporal deliverer: And this, agreeably to the import of the *last* passage quoted from the *Discourses on Prophecy*. But his Lordship has been pleased at other times, to suppose; that his death and

sacrifice were revealed to our first parents, long before he was described under the Law, as a victorious and triumphant leader. Thus, he was at first described as a victim, who was to die for the sins of mankind; and afterwards as a temporal deliverer, surrounded with all the magnificence and pomp of worldly splendor. Now, were not the different links of the chain well connected and disposed to illustrate and explain these different representations of the *Messiah*; when his Lordship himself assures us, that the *Jews* were unable to accord the prophetic links, or to consider them as relative to *the same person*?

There is no point which his Lordship labours more to support, than his exposition of the original Prophecy; which declared, that *the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head*. He assures us, that the promise of life and immortality, or the *spiritual* office and character of the *Messiah*, was sufficiently revealed to our first parents in these words.

Now, the common hypothesis, which his Lordship likewise espouses, is, that this character and office was marked out more distinctly from time to time, or gradually opened and unfolded in the *chain of prophecies* so often mentioned. But why a long chain to



open and unfold a character *gradually*; which had been sufficiently revealed all at once in the first link? This seems to be the adorning and fitting up of this *favourite* link at the expence of the rest, while he makes it do the business of almost all the rest together!

The natural idea of this famous *chain* draws us to expect nothing more from the first links of it, than some faint, obscure, and imperfect delineations of the *Messiah's* office and character. It is inconceivable, how they could give any plain and obvious intimations of the *spiritual* character of the *Messiah*; without violating the order and harmony of the whole chain.

The natural idea of such a continued connexion would previously dispose us to look for more plain and explicit revelations of this character in the age of the Law, than in the beginning and infancy of the world. And yet, on these principles, we find that the *Messiah* is set forth in the writings of Moses and the Prophets, under the character of a *temporal* Prince; and in the revelations, to Adam, as a *spiritual* Deliverer.

Thus, the two different descriptions of his office and character, lie in a confused, and even an inverted order.

His

His Lordship observes, " that *Christ* has " been set forth, from the beginning, under " *different degrees of light*." But, unfortunately for his system, we meet with most light, where it prepares us to expect the least; and, on the contrary, we find least, where it directs us to look for most. For it supposes, that the character and office of the *Messiah* was more plainly delineated in the first Prophecies, and more obscurely in the succeeding ones.

He tells us, that, in our controversies with Unbelievers, we are not to urge the Prophecies *singly* and *independently*, as so many distinct arguments; but are to confront our adversaries with the long scheme and *chain* of Prophecies, considered and compared together; as the more likely way to silence and convince them".

The great writer, who is alone able to supply the insufficiency and defect of his Lordship's argument, or to maintain this chain of Prophecies on *uniform and consistent principles*, has indeed observed the same thing. That the fittest way of urging Prophecies, when we are engaged with *Philosophers* and

P. 252.

Preface to Discourses, &c.

*Free-thinkers*, is to propose them *systematically*, and in a chain<sup>w</sup>.

But what will these *Philosophers* and *Free-thinkers* say; if we offer them a chain of Prophecies, which have no more connexion than a chain of sand; and no more order or gradation, than a fortuitous heap of Pagan oracles? A chain, which presents them with the most plain and distinct Prophecies of Gospel truths; where both our own principles, and the nature and reason of the thing, would dispose us to look for the more faint and obscure ones? A chain of Prophecies, thus circumstanced, would be so far from serving to blind or entangle this Proteus of a Deist; that it tends only to disgrace the advocate of revelation.

In Poetry, perhaps, this *ὄρεγον πρὸς ὄρεγον* might be in its place; and find an example to do it credit, in the famous golden chain of *Homer*, where the upper links must needs be supposed the brightest, as being nearest to the throne of *Jove*. But it is in Divinity, I conceive, as in the other Sciences; where truth keeps gradually opening, 'till it comes to it's *meridian*.

However, his Lordship assures us, we never shall succeed in the argument with the

<sup>w</sup> Dr. Warburton's *Sermons*, vol. i. p. 125.



Deists; unless we confront them with this *chain of Prophecies*. In good time: But then, why will he draw us into principles; which are evidently inconsistent with the supposition of such a Chain?

Upon the whole, it seems to be the common opinion of Divines; that we shall be unable to defend Revelation, unless we suppose these two things; 1<sup>st</sup>, That it always contained the doctrine of a *future state*; and that the *spiritual* character of the *Messiah* was opened from the beginning: 2<sup>dly</sup>, That it has provided, for it's own support, a long and well-connected chain of prophecies. And yet, most true it is, (and as strange, that so obvious a truth should not be perceived) that these two Principles are absolutely inconsistent and destructive of one another.\*

\* A late writer undertakes to shew, that "natural and revealed Religion, have, upon the whole, been progressive; from the creation of the world, to the present time\*."

To say, that revealed Religion has always been progressive, is only saying, that there has been a regular order and series of revelations; which gradually opened and unfolded the will and counsels of God. The *progressive* scheme, therefore, is the same with the chain of Prophecies above-mentioned; it is not a *new* System, but only a *new name* for an *old* one.

The question then is, whether the learned person, who has presented it to us under this new title, has supported

\* Preface to Dr. Law's Considerations.

*Free-thinkers*, is to propose them *systematically*, and in a chain<sup>w</sup>.

But what will these *Philosophers* and *Free-thinkers* say; if we offer them a chain of Prophecies, which have no more connexion than a chain of sand; and no more order or gradation, than a fortuitous heap of Pagan oracles? A chain, which presents them with the most plain and distinct Prophecies of Gospel truths; where both our own principles, and the nature and reason of the thing, would dispose us to look for the more faint and obscure ones? A chain of Prophecies, thus circumstanced, would be so far from serving to bind or entangle this Proteus of a Deist, that it tends only to disgrace the advocate of revelation.

In Poetry, perhaps, this *ύστερον προτερον* might be in its place; and find an example to do it credit, in the famous golden chain of *Homer*, where the upper links must needs be supposed the brightest, as being nearest to the throne of *Jove*. But it is in Divinity, I conceive, as in the other Sciences; where truth keeps gradually opening, 'till it comes to it's *mediæ*.

However, his Lordship assures us, we never shall succeed in the argument with the

<sup>w</sup> Dr. Warburton's *Sermons*, vol. i. p. 125.

Deists; unless we confront them with this *chain of Prophecies*. In good time: But then, why will he draw us into principles; which are evidently inconsistent with the supposition of such a Chain?

Upon the whole, it seems to be the common opinion of Divines; that we shall be unable to defend Revelation, unless we suppose these two things; 1<sup>st</sup>, That it always contained the doctrine of a *future state*; and that the *spiritual* character of the *Messiah* was opened from the beginning: 2<sup>dly</sup>, That it has provided, for it's own support, a long and well-connected chain of prophecies. And yet, most true it is, (and as strange, that so obvious a truth should not be perceived) that these two Principles are absolutely inconsistent and destructive of one another. \*

\* A late writer undertakes to shew, that "natural and revealed Religion, have, upon the whole, been progressive; from the creation of the world, to the present time\*."

To say, that revealed Religion has always been progressive, is only saying, that there has been a regular order and series of revelations; which gradually opened and unfolded the will and counsels of God. The *progressive* scheme, therefore, is the same with the chain of Prophecies above-mentioned; it is not a *new* System, but only a *new name* for an *old* one.

The question then is, whether the learned person, who has presented it to us under this new title, has supported

\* Preface to Dr. Law's Considerations.



But it is time to return to his Lordship's interpretation of the passage in the book of

it with more success, than those who went before him. To determine this, we must examine what doctrines he assigns to the ages preceding the Law, and to those under it. Now, he holds, that the promise of redemption and a future state, was revealed immediately after the fall, and made the *sanction* of the primeval Religion †. He holds, too, that the same promise was renewed to *Abraham*, who was made acquainted with the death and sacrifice of *Christ*. And he supposes likewise, (for without this, the other is nothing to the purpose) that *Abraham* and his family were to propagate this doctrine, together with its consequences, wheresoever they went †.

We proceed next to the Jewish revelation; which, according to the progressive scheme, should reveal a new scene of mysteries, relating to the redemption of mankind. For he pretends to have proved, "that the several dispensations of Religion have been gradually opened; so, as regularly to rise out of, and improve upon, each other \*\*." Yet here he owns, that "the Law was a *school-master*, to teach the *Jews* the rudiments of Religion ††." And yet it was given (if you will believe him) after their forefathers had been initiated in the most sublime doctrines of Religion; or the redemption of mankind, by the sacrifice of the Son of God. And now what is become of his *progressive* motion, (unless it signifies, the *advancing backwards*) if we assign only the carnal rudiments of this Religion to the age of the Law; and its more spiritual and perfect principles to the preceding times?

He says, that *Abraham* and his family were commissioned to propagate the doctrine of the redemption of mankind, by the sacrifice of the Son of God, "together with its consequences, wheresoever they went." And yet, he holds, that the province of *Moses* and the *Prophets* did not extend thus far; but that preaching up the knowledge of the one supreme God, was the principal

† P. 54. ‡ P. 65. \*\* P. 143. †† P. 97.

*Job*; and to shew that it is directly repugnant to many things advanced in his own *Discourses on Prophecy*.

end of their mission; and that belief in *him* was all which was then required \*. If therefore the several revelations were suited to the respective circumstances and capacities of the people to whom they were given, it will follow, that the world, in the time of *Abraham*, was ripe for the sublime doctrines of the Gospel, together with the knowledge of the one true God. It will follow also, that the world, in the time of the Jewish Prophets, was ripe only for the last of these doctrines, and not for the first. It may possibly be so; for the world might go *backward* in religious knowledge. But the misfortune is, that the learned Doctor cannot go backwards with it; as he has engaged to accompany it only in its *progressive* motions.

“ The Prophets (says the learned person) were sent to  
 “ prepare them for, and *gradually* open to them, the  
 “ prospect of that great and universal blessing, the end  
 “ and completion of all his promises—the *Messiah*; in  
 “ whom were laid up the *sure mercies of David*; mercies  
 “ of a much higher nature, than any of those which  
 “ they were then expecting; who shall procure for  
 “ them a far more noble and extensive kingdom, than  
 “ they had ever dreamt of; should make them brethren  
 “ and fellow-citizens with all the world here, and fellow-  
 “ heirs to a more valuable inheritance in the world to  
 “ come †.”

If the *Jews* did not *dream* of any spiritual deliverance, or inheritance in the world to come; we must suppose the Prophets did not explain the spiritual character of the *Messiah*, or the real nature and constitution of his Kingdom. They did not therefore *improve* upon, but *fell far short* of, the character and description of the *Messiah*, which had been given in the Patriarchial ages.

\* P. 139, 140. † P. 90, 99.

"The blessings belonging to the special  
"covenant, given to *Abraham*, and to his

But why (unless the learned Doctor's scheme from *progressive* is become *retrograde*) was there a *gradual*, that is, partial and inadequate revelation, of this grand blessing, in the very centre of that holy family, to which it had been completely and perfectly revealed so many centuries before?

The learned person objects, that the authors of other systems "are forced to make the state of the world  
"often go backwards, to rise and fall again; and be  
"filled with breaks and inequalities; instead of observ-  
"ing that regular, even progress, which will appear in  
"all parts of the divine oeconomy \*." But, does not he himself incur the very absurdity, which he so freely ridicules in others? For how can he preserve a regular *even progress*, whilst he contends that the character and kingdom of the *Messiah* were more perfectly and accurately delineated in the age of the Patriarchs, than in that of the Jewish Prophets?

He affirms, that the Israelites could not have a more perfect covenant; that is, such a one as contains the promise of eternal life; because they were not yet ripe for the reception of this doctrine †. But if the first and more early ages were capable of receiving it, how can he assign this incapacity to the *Israelites* in the time of *Moses*, without contradicting, and even inverting, the order of his system?

The learned Gentleman observes, that "The whole  
"institution of the *Jews* was a state of discipline and  
"bondage under the elements of the world; a sort of servile  
"confinement and tutelar regimen, conducting them by  
"present temporal rewards and earthly prospects; afford-  
"ing, only a dark, distant intimation of better things,  
"and introducing these in figurative representations, by  
"sacrifices, types, and emblems; till they, as well as the

\* P. 38, 59. † P. 93, 98.



" seed, (says his Lordship) were reserved to  
 " be revealed in God's appointed time. The  
 " Prophets under the Law, could not be com-  
 " missioned to declare these blessings nakedly  
 " and openly, without anticipating the time  
 " of their revelation. Hence it is, that the  
 " predictions concerning *Christ* and his king-  
 " dom, are cloathed in such figures, as were  
 " proper to raise the hope and attention of the  
 " people, without carrying them beyond the  
 " bounds of knowledge, prescribed by God,  
 " to this age of the Jewish covenant.

" rest of the world were got out of their *minority*, and  
 " fit to enter on, and make a proper use of, their *inhe-*  
 " *heritance* †."

How can he suppose, consistently with the order and  
 gradation of his *progressive* scheme, that the Law affords  
 only a dark and distant intimation under types and em-  
 blems, of those *better things*, which had been plainly  
 and explicitly revealed in the Religion of the Pa-  
 triarchs?

The learned Writer pretends, that the Jews, and the  
 rest of the world were yet in their state of *minority*; and  
 so not qualified to enter on their inheritance, or receive  
 the doctrine of a future state. This seems very extra-  
 ordinary. The people of God and the rest of the world  
 were come to full *maturity*, in the time of Abraham; and  
 are returned back to their *minority*, in the time of Moses.  
 Now the supposition of a *second childhood*, might serve to  
 reconcile these appearances. But what supposition will  
 serve to reconcile them to the Doctor's equable *pro-*  
*gression* of truth?

† P. 98.

In

In every sentence of this paragraph his Lordship supposes, that the grand article of the Gospel, or the promise of life and immortality, was not plainly delivered, either in the Law, or any other previous revelation. Every sentence therefore of this paragraph is a direct contradiction to his Lordship's exposition of this famous text in the book of *Job*. For *Job* was surely a prophet, tho' not *under the Law*; and his prophecies were, by divine providence recorded, preserved, and published for the use of those who were. I speak on his Lordship's own system, and on the system of those who suppose it prior to any other part of the canon, and written by the hero of the piece.

He says, "The hopes of futurity were *reserved to be revealed*, by him, whose province it was to bring life and immortality to light through the Gospel." But how was this *reserved*, as a province *proper and peculiar* to *Jesus*; if, as his Lordship tells us, *a plain prophetic description* of this very article was given in the book of *Job*?

He observes, that the ancient *Jews* were unable to reconcile the prophecies promising an *everlasting kingdom* to the *Messiah* with

those that sentenced him to a life of *miser*y and *forrow*, and declared that his *affliction* should pursue him to the grave. "The resurrection of Christ reconciled all these difficulties, and seeming inconsistencies: And we now readily admit these prophecies in their plain literal sense, which was a very plain one before, tho' a very hard one to be imagined or believed."

If the *Jews* saw a plain description of the general resurrection in the book of *Job*; and understood, from the passage in question, that the *Messiah* was to stand in the later day upon the earth, in glory and triumph; they must have seen, that he was something more than a temporal deliverer; or that he was to enjoy a spiritual kingdom, after he had been condemned, executed, and lain in the grave. And if so, how could the literal sense of the prophecies above mentioned, have been more hard to be imagined and believed by them then, than it is us by now?

The circumstances mentioned by my Lord Bishop could create no sort of embarras; unless the *Jews* had been taught to look upon the *Messiah* in the light of a temporal deliverer only. And how can his Lordship suppose



that they were taught to look upon him in this light only; if, as he says, the doctrine of the general resurrection, which was the completion of his *spiritual* victories, had been plainly and clearly revealed to them in the book of *Job*.

His Lordship is here speaking of the *Jews*, that lived in the time of *Isaiah*; "who is frequently styled the *evangelical* prophet, because of the *many* and *express* prophecies, to be found in him, relating to *Christ*, and his Church."

Thus he supposes, that these *many* and *express* prophecies did not so far enlighten the *Jews*, even in this later period; as to let them into the knowledge of the *spiritual* character of *Christ*, or the genuine and real nature of his kingdom.

Let us examine next, whether the interpretation of this passage in *Job*, be consistent with the principles advanced in his late book of Sermons.

• P. 163, 164.

• In these passages his Lordship supposes, that the doctrine of life and immortality was not revealed to the ancient *Jews*. The passages, therefore, may be turned against him by the Deists; if he should make the doctrine of immortality essential to the Religion of that people.

Here

Here, he says, "*The whole design of the Gospel is styled a mystery, because it was kept secret since the world began, God not having opened or declared his gracious purposes before the coming of Christ.*" With respect to this time of *secrecy and silence*, the Gospel is called *a mystery*, &c.

"In this sense the Gospel is full of mysteries, as containing the secret purposes of God's hidden wisdom in the redemption of the world; which were made manifest by *Christ Jesus, who brought life and immortality to light*."

Is it not strange then, that his Lordship should, at the same time hold, that *a plain prophetic description* (i. e. *a plain revelation*) of the *grand article of the Gospel* was given in these ages of *secrecy and silence*? And yet, there is scarce any one considerable important branch of the Gospel system, which he does not, somewhere or other in his writings, suppose to be revealed in these *secret and silent* times; being so far from making the whole Gospel a *mystery*, that he will hardly suffer any single part of it to come under that denomination.

But it may be, that, from these passages in the *Sermons*, we are to infer, that his

<sup>d</sup> Vol. i. p. 132, 133.

Lordship has at last determined to give up his once favourite interpretation of this text in *Job*, since he concurs with the author of the *D. L.* in asserting, that such a clear revelation is contrary to the *whole scope and tenor* of the New Testament. To be sure, the supposition, that the doctrine of the resurrection remained a *mystery*, notwithstanding it was plainly revealed in the book of *Job*, will be thought a strange one. And as the professed design of his *sixth* Sermon, is to prove that the doctrine of the resurrection was reserved to be revealed by *Jesus Christ*; it may be reasonably esteemed as the result of his more *deliberate and mature reflexions* on this subject. Otherwise his Lordship may appear to have asserted *two first and original* revelations of this doctrine; one delivered in the book of *Job*, and the other in the books of the *New Testament*.

It might, his Lordship gives us to understand, be objected to him; "That if we expound this passage in *Job* of a *future resurrection*, it contains a degree of knowledge in this great mystery beyond the proportion of light communicated to the age in which he lived. 'Tis the peculiar character of our Saviour, *that he brought life and immortality*"



"*tality to light through the Gospel.* And yet  
 " what do we know from the Gospel, more  
 " than is contained in this passage, if it is in-  
 " deed a description of a future resurrection,  
 " to be brought to light by a redeemer, *who*  
 " *shall stand upon the earth at the latter day?*"

To this his Lordship replies, " As to the  
 " degree of light and knowledge contained in  
 " this passage, and which seems to be dis-  
 " proportionate to the age of *Job*, there is  
 " this to be said; there might possibly be  
 " among the few faithful in the world a tra-  
 " ditionary exposition of the promises of God,  
 " grounded upon more express revelations,  
 " made either before or soon after the flood,  
 " than have come down to our times; or as  
 " *Job* was tryed in a very extraordinary man-  
 " ner, he might have as extraordinary a de-  
 " gree of light to support and maintain him  
 " in the conflict. There is nothing in either  
 " of these suppositions, but what is conform-  
 " able to the methods of divine providence.  
 " Nothing that intrenches upon our blessed  
 " Lord's office, who was appointed to *bring*  
 " *life and immortality to light through the Gos-*  
 " *pel.* 'Tis by *Christ*, and by him alone,  
 " that we have God's covenant of *immortality*

“ conveyed to us ; but yet the ancient prophets had a sight of the blessing at a distance, as is evident from many of their predictions. And why might not Job be so honoured, as well as others who lived before the days of our Saviour\* ? ”

But why are we told of Job *seeing at a distance*, if we are to believe from this passage, that he saw it at all ? His own words, *I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day, upon the earth; &c.* inform us, that he saw it as nearly as He did, who preached up Jesus and the resurrection at Athens.

His Lordship's *sixth* sermon is a discourse on the very text, in which Jesus Christ is said to *bring life and immortality to light*. As it gives us his Lordship's *last* thoughts, it may be supposed to give them to us, in the most accurate and best digested manner. Now the avowed design of this discourse, is to prove, that the doctrine of the resurrection was appointed to be *first* and *originally* revealed by Jesus Christ. It will not therefore permit us to suppose, that any such *express revelations* of it were made either before, or soon after the flood ; nor to believe that Job,

\* P. 227, 231, 237.

how extraordinary soever his trial might be, had this extraordinary degree of light to support and maintain him under it.

“ There is (says his Lordship) nothing in either of these suppositions, but what is conformable to the methods of divine providence.” The question at present is not, how conformable these suppositions may be to the methods of divine providence, but how conformable to the great principles advanced in his *sixth* and *third* Sermons; which circumscribe the doctrine of the resurrection, and even that of a future state, to the age of the Gospel.

While his Lordship is thus curious and inquisitive in exploring reasons to evince that these doctrines were not disproportionate to the age of *Job*, or even to that of the flood; he is all the time subverting the great principle advanced in these sermons.

“ ’Tis by *Christ*, and by him *alone* (says his Lordship) “ that we have God’s *Covenant* “ of immortality conveyed to us.”

Here his Lordship would serve himself of a distinction; which, to admit, would bear hard on the divine justice and wisdom. He supposes, that the *blessing* of immortal life was revealed to *Job* and the Patriarchs; but that



the *Covenant* or *condition* on which it is bestowed, was reserved for the revelation of Jesus Christ. As if it was possible to conceive, that God should reveal to mankind a reward, ordained to invite and encourage their obedience; and yet leave them for some thousand years perfectly ignorant, how this obedience was to be exercised; or to what conditions the reward was annexed.

It surely could answer little or no purpose to reveal one without the other. Not to insist on the apparent cruelty of holding out a reward, which was in no body's reach; and out of every man's power to obtain.

But after all, not only the gift of immortal life, but the condition on which it was to be bestowed, had been revealed long before the publication of the Gospel; if we are to credit what his Lordship delivers in the following words. "The true Religion instituted by God has been *one* and *the same*, from the fall of *Adam*; subsisting ever upon the *same principles* of faith<sup>f</sup>." Now if Religion always subsisted on the *same principles* of faith, the *terms* and *conditions* required on the part of Man, must have been always revealed; as well as the life and immortality promised on

<sup>f</sup> Discourses on prophecy, p. 75.

the part of God. The *whole Covenant*, therefore, was revealed long before the coming of *Jesus*. The consequence is, that nothing was left for *Jesus* to reveal; not even what his Lordship himself calls, "The *grand article* of the Gospel."

The learned Prelate has taken much pains to prove, that God originally revealed a *Covenant* to *Adam*, *Noah*, and *Abraham*<sup>s</sup>. And this he all along describes and considers as the *Covenant of immortality*; the very *Covenant* revealed and delivered by *Jesus Christ* in the Gospel.

It would be ridiculous to say, the *Covenant* was revealed; and yet, as his Lordship's *distinction* would insinuate, that *one half* of it, or the terms and conditions to be observed by one of the Parties, remained unmentioned.

His Lordship observes, in his *fifth* discourse; "that the Prophets were Ministers of *both Covenants*,---that they were commissioned to cherish the hopes and expectations of a better kingdom, to be given in virtue of *God's everlasting Covenant*." And would the Prophets have taught the *Jews* to expect a *better kingdom*, i. e. a heavenly inheritance,

<sup>s</sup> 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, Discourses on prophecy.

in virtue of this everlasting covenant, without inculcating the terms and conditions to which this great blessing was attached?

But how can it be said, that the Prophets preached up the Covenant; and yet that it was *first* and *originally* revealed by *Jesus*?

How could *Job* have been described by the passage in question, as so confidently expecting salvation by *Jesus Christ*; unless God's Covenant of immortality had been revealed? Does not such an assurance imply, that he was well acquainted with *the terms and conditions of this Covenant*; and had fulfilled them?

It seems very extraordinary in his Lordship, to suppose; that the Patriarchs, and that *Job* were acquainted with God's gift of eternal life; and yet not with his *covenant* of immortality. For if we ask whence it can be known, that the Patriarchs had this knowledge of the gift of eternal life; he refers us to some ancient prophecies, which he considers as revelations of *this very Covenant*. If we ask, whence it can be known, that *Job* had the knowledge of this gift; he refers us to the famous text in the nineteenth chapter; which, on his own interpretation, not only implies, (as we say) that *Job knew*, but also

that



that he had *fulfilled* the terms and conditions of the Covenant<sup>i</sup>.

<sup>i</sup> According to my Lord Bishop, these words are a *plain prophetic description of the grand article of the Gospel*. His Chaplain, Dr. Brown, says; "The words are strong; and, as we now see, the publication of the Gospel, beautifully expressive of the sublimest truths; yet were they read, and naturally would be read, without having their meaning clearly conceived; and mankind, in earlier times, *though reading literal truths*, would, *for want of other light*, be unable to understand them in their full and literal sense." Sermons on Job xix. 25, 26. p. 49.

We have often been told, that the ancient prophecies were too *dark* and *obscure* to be understood by the *Jews*: But this before us, it seems, was too *plain* and *simple*.

These *Jews* must have heads of a very extraordinary composition; into which nothing could enter. It has been long held, that the *spiritual* meaning was too *obscure* for their comprehension: It is now at last discovered, that the *literal* meaning was as much too *plain*. Would you have the naked truth?—If the *Jews* will not understand as we would have them, we will not suffer them to understand at all.

But in general, our orthodox gentlemen have taught these people, so long notorious for their obstinacy, to be very complaisant. Sometimes they have such quick and piercing apprehensions, as to spy out the doctrine of a future state under the thickest veil of the mystical and ænigmatical representations of the Law. Sometimes again they are so commodiously dull and heavy, as not to be able to discern the truth, even when stript, as here, in the book of *Job*, to the very skin.

"The text then (says the Dr.) in its natural and obvious meaning is clear, and easy to be understood; and *Job* expected and declared his expectations of a glorious immortality."

Was it possible that life and immortality might be brought to light BEFORE God's

And to confirm this, he has used much pains to prove that *the context* will tie us down to this sense.

But, with all due deference to the Dr, it may yet seem a little strange, that the words were not generally understood; when this was the most *natural* and *obvious* meaning, as being fixed and determined by the *context*. However, he now must never pretend, that the *Jews* were well acquainted with this doctrine; after his unwillingness to let them see it in a passage thus circumstanced.

The aim and purpose of his three Sermons, is; to prove that this passage can only be understood of the resurrection: And yet, towards the conclusion, he affirms; that the *Jews* could only understand it of a temporal restoration?

He was forced into these absurdities by the text, which declares that “ *Jesus Christ* brought life and immortality “ to light through the Gospel.” He strives hard to reconcile these words to the learned Prelate’s interpretation of the famous passage of the book of *Job*. This was indeed to *reconcile light and darkness*; in a very proper sense of the proverb.

He observes, with his learned Patron; that “ ’tis by “ *Christ alone we have God’s Covenant of immortality conveyed to us*. But yet the ancient Prophets had a prospect of the blessing; and why might not *Job* see it at a distance? See it no doubt he did, and he declared his expectation of it in this passage; but it does not from thence follow, that his knowledge *would be communicated to the world*; or that the doctrine which he delivered *would be generally understood* before the fullness of time. —For that mankind, in earlier times, though reading literal truths, would, for want of other light, be unable to understand them in their full and literal sense \*.”

\* P. 49.

Covenant

*Covenant of immortality* was revealed; We must yet conclude, that in fact it was not.

To read *literal truths*, and yet not to be able to understand them for want of other lights; is, as I humbly conceive, like seeing in the sun-shine, and yet not being able to perceive for want of a good clear moon-light. For I desire to know of this Philosopher, what other light the intellect can receive from words, which is superior to LITERAL EXPRESSION; or which, indeed, is not originally derived from it.

The learned Doctor would reconcile the learned Prelate's interpretation of this passage, to the text of St. Paul. And therefore he must assert, that *Job* (whom he supposes to be the author of the book) did not CONVEY God's covenant of immortality.

My Lord Bishop supposes, that *Job* in these words taught the doctrine of a future state *literally* and *plainly*; but did not convey God's Covenant of immortality. The Dr. conscious of the absurdity of *this distinction* between teaching and conveying, as it hitherto stood, has a fetch to set all right by *another distinction*; which is, that *Job* taught the doctrine *literally*, but not *plainly*. If you ask, how it came not to be *plain*, when it was *literal*; all he has to say is, that it did not convey this knowledge to the world. And why will he suppose the knowledge not conveyed? Why, truly he is not fond of the supposition, he adopts it with reluctance; but St. Paul constrained him to make it. This indeed is to be lamented, as the Apostle has constrained him to give up what he was to defend; namely, the vulgar interpretation of the passage; which supposes the doctrine of a future state not only delivered *literally*, but *plainly*. And this I think is supposed with good reason; for what should hinder a *literal truth* from being *plain*; unless it be the bad spelling?

These texts seem to have driven the orthodox Doctor before his time into the quarter of the enemy. For, how unconscious soever he may be of his bad case, he  
For



For St. *Paul* assures us, that the first, or the bare bringing life and immortality to light,

is here asserting the very <sup>principle</sup> ~~doctrine~~ of the *D. L.*: as he supposes the sacred writer was cautious of *communicating this doctrine to the world*. The method, indeed, is his own. It was delivered *plainly*, that it might *not be generally understood*.

However, they both agree, that the doctrine of a future state was secreted in the Old Testament; and differ only as to the manner of secreting it. Dr. *Warburton* thinks, this might be best done by putting it under a veil or cover: Dr. *Brown* supposes, the most effectual way would be to remove the veil, and present it naked to public view.

We have nothing to object to the last method; as it is founded on a plain and simple supposition, That it is not the gathering and condensing, but the scattering and dispersing the clouds, which renders terrestrial objects *invisible*.

I was in the common opinion, that these sermons were published with a design to vindicate my Lord Bishop's exposition of the text in question. But, on second thoughts, this could hardly be the case; for I observe the learned Dr. evidently deserts his Lordship; and unnaturally goes over to the author of the *D. L.*

It was no wonder, that the *typical* representations of a future state should oblige Dr. *Stebbing* to allow, with the author of the *D. L.* that this doctrine was secreted in the Old Testament: But, that a *plain* and *literal* revelation should have driven Dr. *Brown*, averse as he is to the wrong side, into these hostile quarters, may be matter of speculation

If the *Jews* were unqualified to discover this doctrine in a *plain* and *literal* revelation; they could not be qualified to discover it in the *types* and *figures* of the Law: Or, rather, if they were not able to discover it in a

was the peculiar province and office of *Jesus Christ*.

It will indeed be impossible to save the honour of our divine Master, or to assert the Character which the Apostle of the Gentiles here gives him; if this Doctrine had been distinctly revealed in the book of *Job*. On this supposition the glory of bringing it to light would have been due to *another*, and not to *him*.

Had his Lordship's distinction enabled him to evade and set aside the text, which speaks of *Jesus Christ*, as bringing life and immortality to light; yet what could this avail him, while so *many* more stand in his way? So many, that I refer him who would consider them to the first chapter of this work. "And why (says his Lordship) might not *Job* be plain and literal revelation, they could not be capable of discovering it in any revelation whatsoever. To what purpose therefore was it revealed to them?"

But, above all, why should the learned Doctor suppose, that the sacred writer was cautious of communicating this doctrine; if it was intended for the sanction of the Religion of those times?

If he really thinks, that plain and literal expressions were a proper cover and envelope of the doctrines which could not be opened to the Jewish Church; let him take heed that he does not furnish the followers of *L. Bolingbroke* with an unanswerable argument to prove that the types and figures of the Law were superfluous and unnecessary.

"so

“ so honoured as well as others, who lived  
 “ before the time of our Saviour? ” In  
 other words, why might not *Job*, and the de-  
 scendants of *Ishmael*, have been honoured  
 with the same distinction, as *Abram* and  
 his *chosen* seed? And is it consistent in his  
 Lordship to ask this question; after he has  
 declared, on the authority of St. *Paul*<sup>k</sup>, that  
 this honour was intended to be peculiar to  
 the latter?

It would but *multiply* contradictions, to  
 assign this honour to *many others* in com-  
 mon with *Job*; since his Lordship's iii<sup>d</sup> and  
 vi<sup>th</sup> sermons confine it to our Saviour, and  
 will not permit us to extend it to *any one be-*  
*sides*<sup>l</sup>.

<sup>k</sup> Discourses on Prophecy, p. 126.

<sup>l</sup> The most these Sermons will permit him to suppose,  
 is, that it might be communicated to *some* of the ancient  
 Patriarchs and Prophets, as a singular favour; without  
 any commission to propagate and spread it in the ancient  
 world. For had they been commissioned to do this, how  
 could his Lordship affirm, as he does, in his *third* sermon,  
 that it remained a *mystery*, during these ages of *secrecy*  
 and *silence*? Or how could he affirm, as he does, in his  
*sixth*, that the resurrection was reserved to be revealed by  
*Jesus Christ*?

His Lordship contends, in some parts of his *Discourses*  
*on Prophecy*, that the promise of redemption and a future  
 state, was not discovered before the coming of our Saviour.  
 He must, therefore, either suppose, that it was not revealed  
 to *any* of these ancient Worthies; or that it was revealed to  
*some* of them under the limitations above-mentioned.



If his Lordship will say, that the article of the *resurrection* was revealed to *Job*, to *Abraham*, and to others; he must suppose, that it was all along the common belief of the Faithful, as much as the doctrine of a *future state*; and that the one was no more brought to light by *Jesus Christ* than the other.

His Lordship thinks it of importance to establish his interpretation of this text in *Job*,  
 “ as the evidence arising from this book is in  
 “ all respects considerable; and it is of great  
 “ moment to see *those great strokes of true Re-*  
 “ *ligion*, and of God’s purpose from the be-  
 “ ginning of the world, with respect to the  
 “ children of men, preserved in an author,  
 “ who cannot be charged with Jewish educa-  
 “ tion or prejudices; but who was born in  
 “ another country, of another family, and  
 “ does not appear to have heard of *Moses* or  
 “ his Law; and yet *the secret of God* was with  
 “ him <sup>m</sup>.”

He will be obliged to admit *these limitations*, because he supposes, that some Prophecies were given to hide and cover, and others to supply the want of it. For what occasion for these Prophecies, if the doctrine was *promiscuously* revealed to *all*?

Or, what occasion for *so long a chain of Prophecies*, if the plain and clear revelations of redemption and a future state, made to *Abraham*, had been communicated to the *Faithful* without distinction?

<sup>m</sup> P. 126.

Let

Let us try all we can, in God's name, to find the great strokes of true Religion amongst a people, who cannot be charged with Jewish education and prejudices. This is considerable, and of moment for the interest of truth. But let us be very careful, while we are seeking for those great strokes, that we do not do truth more injury on the other side, by inventing interpretations of particular passages, which contradict the whole analogy of faith, and the history of the Christian Dispensation. Now, Job's mention of the resurrection, cannot possibly do credit to the Gospel; if, at the same time, as we have shewn, that mention palpably contradicts the whole tenour of the New Testament.

His Lordship seems to ask full enough, when he requires us to believe, that the resurrection was publicly revealed in the Patriarchal ages; and to believe also, that it was reserved for the New Testament. The first, he asserts, on the authority of the book of Job; and the second, on the authority of St. Paul's Epistles. He does not, therefore, bring the author of this book, as a witness for, but as an accuser of the Apostle of the Gentiles; as magnifying his master's office at the expence of truth.

Again :

Again; If *Job* bears testimony to the doctrine of the *resurrection*; he not only bears testimony against the common honesty of *Paul*, but against the common sense of *Moses*. For the Jewish Lawgiver must have been perfectly infatuated, in aiming to secrete a doctrine from his people; which was plainly revealed to them by *Job*.

It is happy, therefore, for religion; that his Lordship succeeded no better in his attempt to establish the high antiquity of this book, and his particular interpretation of the passage in question.

His Lordship is very solicitous to remove the objection, which charges his interpretation with containing a degree of knowledge in the great *mystery* of the Gospel, beyond the proportion of light communicated to the age in which *Job* lived. He owns, indeed, that the objection seems *considerable*. To prove that it really is so, we need only recapitulate the principal arguments explained and enforced in this chapter. 1<sup>st</sup>, The passages, quoted from the *Discourses on Prophecy*, imply, that such a revelation must have been premature; as it would have carried men beyond those bounds of knowledge, which God had prescribed to the more early ages of the world.



world. *2dly*, The same appears from the passages cited out of the New Testament; which, according to my Lord Bishop's own interpretation, speak of this doctrine as a *mystery*, reserved to be revealed in the Gospel. *3dly*, The notion of a gradual and successive *chain* of Prophecies, throws this revelation at a great distance from the period in question. *4thly*, It appears not to be conformable to the methods and œconomy of divine Providence; to reveal this mystery more plainly to the *Arabs*, than to the Jewish church; *5thly*, It seems irreconcilable to common sense, to veil and cover it under types in the Law, while it was clearly mentioned in the book of *Job*. For surely his Lordship will not venture to say, that it was disproportionate to the age of the Law, and yet suitable to the age of *Job*. *6thly*, If the plain revelation of this mystery was adapted to the age of *Job*, there was no need of its being conveyed in the Law, under temporal and carnal images. As little need was there, that the *Messiah* should be described as a *temporal deliverer* in the Law and the Prophets; if his *spiritual* character was opened and revealed in the time of *Job*. *7thly*, There would have been no occasion for an *extraordinary Providence* under the Law; *8thly*, There

8thly, There could be no need of so many Prophecies relating to the temporal affairs of the Jewish nation; if the doctrine of the *resurrection* was revealed to them in the book of *Job*. For my Lord Bishop attributes the necessity of such a Providence, and the expediency of Prophecies thus circumstanced, to the absence and omission of this doctrine. 9thly, It was very unsuitably recorded by *Job*, and brought into the Jewish canon; because the *previous* knowledge of the *grand article* of the *final* and *ultimate* Religion, must have prejudiced the *Jews* against the Law; and have induced them to treat it with indifference and contempt. 10thly, The faithful would never have been put under, and so long confined to the *rude* and *beggarly* elements of the Law; if they had been so long ripe for the reception of the *grand article* of the *final* and *ultimate* Religion. 11thly, If the doctrine was delivered in the book of *Job*, it was delivered with a purpose to account for the sufferings of the righteous, and the prosperity of the wicked, in the present life: But if so, the subsequent writers under the Law, could not have been embarrassed (as they greatly were) by any appearance of this sort.

Q

These

These are the reasons which induced me to conclude, that the objection is not only *considerable*, as his Lordship owns it to be; but absolutely *unsurmountable*.

Many of these arguments will hold equally against his expositions of some other texts, produced to shew, that *Job* had the knowledge of a future state; and will prove, that they are as little to the purpose, as this we have here examined<sup>\*</sup>.

\* The learned Mr. *Costard* has observed, that the book of *Job* was composed \* *about the captivity*; and that the point in dispute, was, whether the afflictions of the righteous, and the prosperity of the wicked, were consistent with the divine attributes †. He has observed also, that the famous text in the nineteenth chapter, does not relate to a resurrection, but to a temporal deliverance ‡. However, he contends warmly, that the *Jews*, (tho' they knew nothing of a resurrection) must have had the same belief of future rewards and punishments with the ancient Pagans ||.

As I am only enquiring, whether the promise of life and immortality was REVEALED to the ancient *Jews*, it is of no importance whether they had, or had not the same doctrine of another life with the *Pagans*. I shall not, therefore, declare any opinion of my own; but only propose a *quære* to the learned writer.

He owns, that the author of this piece does not attempt to solve the unequal distribution of good and evil in this life, on the principle of a future state; but only appeals to instances of the divine power \*\*. Now, if he believed the common doctrine of a future state, why did he not apply it to the present argument; as it would have effectually cleared up the grand difficulty?

\* Observations on the book of *Job*, p. 18.

† P. 34.

‡ *Ibid.*

|| P. 32, 33.

\*\* P. 34.



It seems surprizing to the learned writer, that they should not have had this doctrine. And may it not seem surprizing to others, that their most able and enlightened writers, should not know how to use it, if they had it; by applying it to account for the appearances of an unequal Providence.

Is their inability to account for this appearance, more natural on the supposition that they had, than on the supposition that they had not this doctrine?

Dr. Law \* has espoused *le Clerc's* interpretation of this text; which supposes, that *Job* and his friends knew nothing of a future state; and so were unable to justify the dispensations of Providence in the present life. I shall here argue on his own concessions, and point out the conclusions to which they naturally lead.

He says, † “The notions of this book are suited to “the patriarchal times.” If so, he must own, that the patriarchal religion was not established on the sanction of a future state. For what so absurd, as to imagine; that *Job* and his friends were not acquainted with the *sanctions* of the common religion of their own times?

And why might not religion be able to subsist, without this sanction, *after* the establishment of the Law; as well as *before*?

He observes, and very justly; that an extraordinary providence was administered in the patriarchal ages. But he will own, that *Job* and his friends saw some inequalities in this administration. I ask, therefore, why they did not infer a future state from these inequalities?

We have been told, that the worshipers of the true God *ought* not to have been left without the knowledge of a future state; as some inequalities occurred in the dispensation of the extraordinary providence. We will suppose the objection addressed, as it fairly may be, to the learned Doctor; who contends, that *Job* and his friends saw these inequalities; and yet knew nothing of a futurity. And in doing this, I have no other view, than to shew; that he is equally concerned with many other writers, to provide a proper answer to this objection.

\* Considerations, p. 68.

† *Ibid.*

" We find (says he) *Job*, and his three friends, entering into the deepest points of divinity; and agreed about the unity, omnipotence, and spirituality of God; the justice of his providence, and other fundamentals of Religion \*." Thus he supposes them to have believed the justice of divine Providence, and the fundamentals of Religion; and yet affirms, with *le Clerc*, that they did not believe a future state. It would be strange in him, after this, to deny the possibility of holding one without the other.

*Considerations*, p. 66, 67.

He says, " If the justice of God be admitted, that the punishment of the wicked is not deferred to the future state, it is not necessary to suppose that the friends of *Job* were not acquainted with the doctrine of a future state."

He says, " If the justice of God be admitted, that the punishment of the wicked is not deferred to the future state, it is not necessary to suppose that the friends of *Job* were not acquainted with the doctrine of a future state."

He says, " If the justice of God be admitted, that the punishment of the wicked is not deferred to the future state, it is not necessary to suppose that the friends of *Job* were not acquainted with the doctrine of a future state."

He says, " If the justice of God be admitted, that the punishment of the wicked is not deferred to the future state, it is not necessary to suppose that the friends of *Job* were not acquainted with the doctrine of a future state."

He says, " If the justice of God be admitted, that the punishment of the wicked is not deferred to the future state, it is not necessary to suppose that the friends of *Job* were not acquainted with the doctrine of a future state."

He says, " If the justice of God be admitted, that the punishment of the wicked is not deferred to the future state, it is not necessary to suppose that the friends of *Job* were not acquainted with the doctrine of a future state."

#### CHAP. IV.

## C H A P. IV.

*Wherein my Lord Bishop of London's account of the particular end and design of the Jewish Law is considered; and shewn to be inconsistent with the nature of a preparatory Religion, and also with several Passages of the New Testament; as well as with his Lordship's Sermons and Discourses on Prophecy.*

**W**E come now to consider one of his Lordship's more general positions; his opinion concerning the end and purpose of the Jewish Dispensation. And this seems to be a matter of no small importance; there being the strongest connexion between the end and purpose of the Law, and The Use and Intent of prophecy, during that Period. If the learned Prelate has succeeded in the first, it is very probable he may not be mistaken in the second. But if we find him wide of the mark, in assign-  
Q
ing



ing the true *End* of the Mosaic Religion; it is more than probable we shall find him at a loss, in explaining the *nature, use, and intent* of Prophecy †.

His great principle, concerning the end of the

† My Lord Bishop contends, that the *main* and most important end of the ancient prophecies was to support the Faith and Religion of the old World; and not to give testimony to the Mission of Jesus. On the other hand, Dr. Middleton affirms; that giving Testimony to the Mission of Jesus was the principal and most important end of the ancient prophecies. *Examin.* p. 93.

I shall not stay to examine the force of the reasons alledged on either side; but, only observe; that one of his Lordship's leading arguments seems to be of a very extraordinary nature. "It is, doubtless, (says he) a mistake  
" to conceive Prophecy to be intended solely or chiefly  
" for their sakes, in whose time the events predicted  
" are to happen. What great occasion is there to  
" lay in so long beforehand the evidence of prophecy,  
" to convince men of things that are to happen in  
" their own times; the truth of which they may, if  
" they please, learn from their own senses." *Discourses on prophecy*, p. 37, 38.

By this, it would seem (tho' the designed purpose here discredited, is unfairly represented) that his Lordship was insensible, or at least, while he was writing, inattentive, to two points of great moment. The one, the two-fold Character of Jesus, of *Messiah*, and *Messenger from God* simply: [see Dr. W's Sermons, V. 1.] the other, the difference between the use of his being foretold to those who saw Jesus in the flesh, and the use

the Law, is; "that the *Jewish Church* was  
 "founded to preserve, and to administer  
 "the hopes, which had been revealed  
 "to the Patriarchs (a). And these,  
 according to his Lordship, were the hopes  
 of *eternal life* to be procured by the Re-  
 deemer of Mankind.

As the Law succeeded the patriarchal Re-  
 ligion, in the natural order and course of  
 God's Dispensations; it must without doubt  
 have been given to re-inforce and re-establish  
 the great principles of this Religion; what-  
 soever those principles were.

What we have here inferred, from the  
 natural course and order of the two dispen-

use of it to those who have lived since. Now these two  
 considerations shew, that the *evidence of Prophecy* was of  
 the utmost propriety to convince Christians, (for that is  
 the only sensible meaning of the words, *to convince men*  
*of things that are to happen in their own times*) of the  
 truth of their religion. For, as to the first point, tho' mi-  
 racles alone, established his Character of a *divine Messen-*  
*ger* simply; yet there was need of *Prophecies* to establish  
 his Character of *Messiah*. Again, as to the other, the  
 truth of Jesus's miracles: those who saw them might  
 indeed, as his Lordship expresses it, *learn by their*  
*senses*. But all who came after had only human testi-  
 mony or tradition; which receives infinite addition of  
 force from the application of correspondent Prophecies.

(a) P. 145, 6.

Q 2

fations,

sations, is confirmed by the positive testimony of St. Paul; who declares, *The Law was added* to the Religion of the Patriarchs, *because of Transgressions* (a); i. e. the idolatrous deviations from that Religion: into which Idolatry the rest were already gone, and the Jews then hastening apace; and from which they could be restrained no otherwise, than by this *Addition*. The Law then was given to preserve the great principles of the Patriarchal System from the ruin and extinction with which they were threatened; or to restore and re-assert the religious truths and doctrines revealed by it.

All therefore, who hold that life and immortality was revealed *before* the Law, and made a part of the patriarchal Religion, will be obliged to come into the sentiments of the learned Prelate; and to maintain, that the Law was given to preserve and to administer the hopes of eternal life, which had been revealed to the Patriarchs.

What we are to examine is, Whether the doctrine of eternal life ~~was to be revealed before the law~~ <sup>was to be revealed before the law</sup> or no. The Question would be of consequence, if it were only that it

(a) D. L. v. 2. p. 361.



helps us to determine the dispute concerning the Religion of the Patriarchs. For if the Law was given to re-establish and re-inforce the grand articles of this Religion, as it certainly was; and yet was not given to re-establish and re-inforce the doctrine of Redemption and a future state, as it certainly was not; the dispute is at an end.

It is agreed on all hands, that the Law was instituted to preserve the doctrines, which had been the Foundation of the Patriarchal Religion. His Lordship contends, that the principle of Redemption and a future state was one of these. The Question therefore to be debated with him, is; whether the Law was given to administer and preserve this doctrine.

His Lordship, who follows the common opinion, supposes, that the patriarchal and the Christian Religion were indeed one and the same. The point therefore to be considered is, Whether the Law was appointed to administer and dispense the fundamental articles of the Gospel. And here I have the pleasure to observe, that the bare stating of the Question, seems sufficient to expose the grossness and extravagance of the System I am going to confute.

1st. then, It will be seen, that his Lordship's supposition is inconsistent with the nature of the Law; considered as a *preparatory* or *introductory* Dispensation. 2. That there is nothing to countenance and support it in the Old Testament. 3. That it directly contradicts many texts of the New; and also several passages in his Lordship's *Sermons* and *Discourses on Prophecy*.

To begin with the first. "The prophecies of the several periods already considered (says his Lordship) have been found to correspond to the state of Religion in the world, at the time of giving the prophecy: A great presumption, that the case is the same under the *Jewish* Dispensation. We must therefore, in order to our present inquiry, consider the state of Religion under the *Mosaic* Dispensation." (a)

If we consider the state of this Religion, we shall find; that both in its *nature* and *end* it bears all the marks of a *preparatory* System. And can we infer from the nature of such an institution, that it was given to administer and dispense the great hopes and promises of the final and ultimate Religion?

(a) P. 140.

The contrary cannot but be the Truth. But let us consider the case a little more distinctly.

The Author of the epistle to the *Hebrews* has informed us; that the Law contained only a *shadow*, or nothing more than the bare *rudiments* and *elements*, of the Gospel. But is it natural or reasonable to imagine; that *Infants* and *Pupils*, trained and disciplined under the mere *elements* and *rudiments* of the Gospel, were ripe for its more sublime and perfect doctrines? And yet this must have been the case; if the Law was appointed to preserve and administer the hopes and promises attached to the spiritual Covenant.

The passing through this previous discipline of mere carnal elements, could serve no other purpose than to mispend their time, and retard their progress towards greater and better things; if indeed those things were due to their Dispensation.

It is unaccountable his Lordship should suppose, that the *Jews* were the proper objects of two such different methods of discipline and instruction, at the same time. There must have been something very singular and uncommon in the character of this



People; if they were so dull and cloudy in one quarter of their heads, as to need the mere carnal rudiments of an introductory system; and yet, so spiritual and enlightened in the other, as to be qualified to receive the sublime truths of a final and ultimate Religion.

All this is just as natural, as it would be to teach children their *horn-book*, and the *Essay on human Understanding*, at the same time.

The absurdity will rise still higher; if we consider the argument in another light. According to his Lordship, the principal branches of the Christian Religion had been revealed in the Patriarchal Covenant: and yet the rudiments and elements of this religion were delivered *afterwards* in the Law. But is it possible, that persons, previously instructed in the more sublime parts of science, should *after* this be taught their elements; or that their time could be usefully employed in learning them over again?

It is directly inverting the natural order of Things, to suppose; that the more sublime branches of science were delivered first, and the mere rudiments and elements taught afterwards. At least, his Lordship will own; that the method of teach-

teaching *divine* wisdom was just the reverse of that employed by the Masters of *human*. For it is usual with these to begin with the rudiments, and to ascend gradually to the more perfect and sublime principles. But here, the more perfect and sublime are taught first; and the study of the elements reserved for a more mature and *advanced* age.

His Lordship often speaks of the Law, as being a *preparatory* system. And such it would properly and strictly be; if it contained nothing more than the bare rudiments of the Christian Faith. But if you say, it likewise taught the sublime doctrines of the final and ultimate Religion; you will unavoidably make it something more than a mere preparatory System. On this supposition it might as well be called the *Gospel* as the *Law*.

To proceed. His Lordship observes in another place; "That the ancient prophecies, relative to the spiritual covenant, were given to establish and confirm the hopes of Futurity; and to *prepare and make ready the people for the reception of the Kingdom of God (a).*"

(a) p. 127.

If

If the Prophets were sent to *establish* the Christian hopes of immortality, they were sent to *establish*, and not to prepare *the way* for, the Kingdom of God.

If the people had received these hopes, they had *already* received the Kingdom of God. And what occasion for an *introductory* system, to *prepare and make ready* the people for the Reception of a Blessing which they had *already* received.

(a) The learned Prelate speaks of the Religion

(a) A late writer, much in the same sentiments, says, "The Law of the Jews was a *School-master* to teach them the *Rudiments* of Religion." (Dr. Law's Consideration, p. 97.) And what is this but saying, that the *Rudiments* of Religion were designed for *one* age; and the doctrines of perfection for *another*? To suppose that the Jews were instructed in both, would be as absurd as to imagine, that the learned Dr. would teach his Children their Alphabet, and the most abstruse and profound parts of Metaphysics, at the same time.

However, he contends, that the Types were declared to be *significative* of good things to come. I must then take the liberty to ask, whether they were declared to be figurative of good things *in general*; or of the *particular* blessings which were delineated by them. On the last supposition, the Law would have been something more than a *School-master*; since it would have taught the doctrine of perfection, as well as the *Rudiments* of Religion; and consequently have deserved a better character, than he has given it in the passage just quoted. If he



ligion of the *Jews*, as being preparatory "to  
 " that *new* dispensation; which was in *due*  
 " time to be revealed (a)." There seems to  
 be

he says, that the Types were only declared to be predictive of good things in *general*, and not of the *particular* good things delineated by them; he must assert, with the Author of the *D. L.*; that the doctrines exhibited under Types, were secreted from the ancient *Jews*.

And here, again, what says he to the Types that were figurative of a future state? If they were declared to be expressive of bliss and happiness to be enjoy'd in a *future life*; the Law must have been something more than a *School-master*, and have taught something more than the *Rudiments* of Religion; contrary to the Doctor's declaration above. If he says, these Types were only declared to be significative of some blessing in *general*, without specifying whether it belonged to this life or another; he must maintain, with the Author of the *D. L.*; that the doctrine of a future state was purposely concealed from the *Jewish Church*.

However the learned Doctor has himself given a very *curious* instance of a Type, which was hardly understood in its full extent by the ancient *Jews*. 'Tis where he observes, that the place and circumstances of our Saviour's Birth may be urged to prove that he was the son of *David*. "For that *David* was called to  
 " the Throne from a Sheepfold and a *Stable*—and had  
 " perhaps lived in the *same Stable*, in which Jesus was born". p. 65.

Now if I should allow the reality of the Type, it would be very perverse in the learned Writer to deny me the liberty of supposing that it was not known under the Law.

be something extremely just and pertinent in supposing, that the *new* dispensation was reserved to be revealed in *due time*. For the giving a *preparatory* system necessarily implies an incapacity and inability in the *Jews* to bear the final and ultimate Religion. But such an incapacity or inability is more than a demonstration, that they were not appointed to live under that Dispensation; or, in other words, were not to have the doctrines of it revealed unto them.

The very notion of a *preparatory* and *final* Religion, implies, that they were designed for two different and distinct ages of the world. For the preparatory system, if the words have any meaning, must be intended to open the way to one more perfect; which was to *succeed*, and come *after* it. (a)

When-

(a) Some writers seem to imagine, that the Law was given to instruct the more early *Jews* in the nature and promises of the new covenant; and that this *previous instruction* was the very circumstance which made it a *preparatory* System. But we have shewn, that in this sense it was not a preparatory system at all. For it was so far from giving the more early *Jews* any previous information of these particulars; that it aimed to hide and conceal them under the cover of Types and Figures.

And,

Whenever the final and ultimate Religion was introduced, the preparatory must cease of course. If therefore *Moses* revealed the great

And, indeed, what would such previous information have done? Why, it would have been so far from being subservient to the preparatory system, that it must have put a sudden stop to it; by inducing the *Jews* to shake off all obedience and subjection to the Law of *Moses*.

St. *Paul* indeed says, "The Law was a *Schoolmaster*"; appointed to lead the *Israelites* to *Christ*. This Representation has been urged as a proof, that it must have taught the essential articles of the Gospel.

In this dispute, things, which seem plain to some, have been so plainly denied by others; that one would think men had different *understandings*, as well as different *tastes*; and that the proverb wanted to be extended, that we might no longer dispute about either. To me, this language of the Apostle seems rather to infer, that the Law did not teach these fundamental articles. For what is the acknowledged province of a *Schoolmaster*, but to teach his pupils the rudiments and elements of things; while the knowledge of the sublime doctrines, erected on these, is reserved for another *season*, and another *Instructor*.

It has been asked, How the Law could be preparatory to the Gospel; unless the first taught the main and principal doctrines pertaining to the last? — Let me ask, in my turn, How the Hornbook could be a preparation to the *Essay on Human Understanding*? And, I presume, he, who can answer one question, may easily answer the other. — Again. Is not marking out the ground, preparatory to the building?  
And



great truths and principles of the Gospel, he at the same time put an end and period to the Law.

Ac-

And yet the ground is not part of the building. But this Relation between the Law and the Gospel is still closer. For the Unity and the moral attributes of the Deity, which the Law taught and inculcated, were fundamental parts of the Religion of the Gospel: and surely, if any thing could have done it, would have prepared and disposed the Jews for the sublime doctrines of redemption and a future state.

It is strange that a Dispensation, which reveals the nature and attributes of the one true God, should not be allowed to be preparatory to another, which contained these very doctrines, with some additions peculiar to itself.

The Law prepared the way for the Gospel, not only by keeping up the knowledge and worship of the true God, but also by foretelling a future Kingdom, which was to be erected, in due time, by his Son. And surely it might teach the Israelites to expect a new Kingdom, without teaching them the precise nature and properties of that Kingdom.

To say that the Law cannot lead to Christ, or to the Expectation of a new Kingdom, unless the peculiar Articles of the Christian Religion, and the peculiar nature of this Kingdom are explained by it; would be saying you will never have any appetite for a great benefit promised, till you know the whole extent of the Benefit. This indeed is hardly common sense, but it is Theology; Artificial Theology: indeed, as Lord Halingbroke calls it: And if he confined the nick-name to this kind of Theology, few, I suppose, will think he miscalled it.

In

According to my Lord Bishop, *Moses* and the Prophets were sent to establish and confirm the hopes of futurity; or the grand article of the Gospel. The End therefore of their mission was to declare the Law superfluous and unnecessary; even at the very time they enjoined a strict observance of it, and spoke of it as designed to continue and last for ever.

Revealing the principles of the Gospel, would, in effect, have been branding the Law, as an idle and impertinent Institution; and must have tended to wean and alienate the minds of the *Jews* from a faithful and steady attachment to it.

As his Lordship says, the Law was given to *perpetuate* and *preserve* the doctrines which had been revealed to the patriarchs; he must suppose, it was not given to open and prepare the way for a *new* dispensation to be revealed in due time; but to support a system which had been *already* revealed.

But

In a word; St. *Paul* not only tells us, that the Law leads to the Gospel; (which these men would have accompanied it, and be a part of it) but informs us also, in what manner it performs this office. He says, it was just as the *Letters of the Alphabet* lead to discourses in Science; or as the *rudiments* of a System lead to the sublime conclusions of it.

But is not this a strange Character and Description of what he himself calls a *preparatory* or *introductory* System. For what so extravagant and preposterous, as to imagine that the preparatory System did not take place, till the final and ultimate one had been previously established? This would be to suppose, that the superstructure was raised *first*; and then the foundation was *afterwards* laid to support it.

According to his Lordship's notion of a *gradual* and *successive* order in the ancient Revelations, every subsequent dispensation *improves* upon that which went before; and naturally rises out of it. But if his Lordship says, that the Law was an *improvement* of the *Abrahamic* or *Christian* Covenant; he must say, that the preparatory system regularly rose out of the final and ultimate religion.

This he will be obliged to say: And he must say too, that this final and ultimate Religion did afterwards in its turn arise and spring out of the preparatory System.

The order of things seems to be strangely violated by his Lordship's scheme; since it makes the preparatory System both the *super-structure*,



*structure*, and the *Foundation* to the final and ultimate Religion. For the Law was a *Super-structure* built upon this Religion, as it had been revealed to the Patriarchs: It was also the *Foundation* of this Religion, as it was afterwards revealed in the Gospel.

It will be in vain to talk of any regular and orderly gradation, with respect to these Revelations; if the preparatory was both *preceeded* and *succeeded* by the final and ultimate Religion; or if the final was both the natural *introduction* to and the natural *consequence* of, the preparatory. (a)

R

The

(a) Dr. Law says, he has proved, “ that the several “ dispensations of Religion have been gradually opened; “ so as regularly to *rise out* of, and *improve* upon, each other”. *Considerations*, p. 164.

If we take his word, he has proved likewise; that the doctrine of Redemption by the sacrifice of the Son of God, was a popular and common notion in the patriarchal times. He must suppose therefore, that the Patriarchal Religion was the same with the Christian.—On the principles therefore of his progressive scheme, He must say; that the *Law* was an *improvement* of the Christian Covenant, and *regularly rose* out of it. Yet has he enforced those principles in such a manner, as will oblige him likewise to say; that this Covenant *regularly rose out* of the Law, and *improved* upon it.

It gives me great pain to differ so often from this worthy and learned Writer; but his known Candour will make any Apology unnecessary, as he cannot but see I have no  
other

The different Spirit and Genius of the two Covenants, is a plain proof; that the Law was not fitted to preserve, and to administer the hopes and promises of the patriarchal Religion; if these were the same with the Christian.

The Law every where instills a spirit of *Terror* and *Bondage*; and is on this account opposed to the Gospel, which breaths a spirit of *Love* and *Freedom*. Now, according to his Lordship's System, the Jews must have been fitted to receive the slavish and abject impressions of the Law, together with the more liberal and ingenuous ones of the Patriarchal or Christian Covenant.

And, what is more, he must suppose; that the spirit of *Love* and the spirit of *Bondage*, were to be enforced together by the *same System*. For the Law was to convey the *gracious promises* of the Gospel or Patriarchal Covenant, along with its own *threats* and *terrors*.

The Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews seems to have admitted but *one Half* of his Lord-

other view than to get the Question examined to the bottom; and the *Jewish* Law freed from the many perplexities, in which the advocates of the common System have involved it.

Lordship's doctrine; when he says, "The  
 " *Jews* were all their life time *subject* to  
 " *Bondage* through *Fear* of Death". (a)

To say that the Law was given to preserve,  
 and to administer the Hopes and Promises  
 of the Patriarchal or Gospel Covenant, would  
 be saying that a spirit of servile awe and  
 terror was impress'd in order to raise and  
 cherish a spirit of filial piety and love.

Had the Patriarchal System been, as his  
 Lordship supposes, the same with the Chri-  
 stian; and had the Law been subservient to  
 the same end, or was it intended to cultivate  
 and promote the same scheme of Salvation;  
 the *same means* must have been employ'd, and  
 the Administration of the two Dispensations  
 must have been conducted by the *same Spirit*.  
 It is as much a contradiction to suppose,  
 that two contrary Spirits should be inculcated  
 by two Religions, which aimed at the same  
 end; as that contrary means should be fitted  
 to produce the same Effect.

According to his Lordship, the Patriarchal  
 must have been a very pure and spiritual  
 Religion; as it was not incumbered with  
 many Rites and Ceremonies, and in its main  
 principles exactly co-incided with the Gospel.

(a) P. 2, 14.



Now, upon the supposition that Providence intended to attach the *Israelites* to a Religion thus circumstanced; the Law would have been not only an useless, but even a pernicious, Institution. For the minute observance of so complicated a Ritual would have tended to deaden, rather than to invigorate, the *Worship in Spirit and in Truth*, which must have been required by the Patriarchal or Christian System. The wearisom multiplicity, and scrupulous punctualities of these Ceremonies, would have perpetually employ'd the People; and have afforded no time for a more pure and spiritual worship, no time to attend to the better and more perfect Dispensation: The preparatory Religion would not then, as his Lordship imagines, have tended to raise and elevate their thoughts to that which was final and ultimate; but must rather have alienated and estranged them from it.

If they had a more pure and perfect System of worship, than that prescribed by the Law; why were they incumber'd with such a multifarious Ritual, as would necessarily divert their attention from this higher and better System; and tend to confine their thoughts to these *beggarly and meagre Elements*.

Thus

Thus the Rites, the spirit, the very genius of the Law, do all conspire to prove, that it was not given to dispense the spiritual hopes of the Gospel. On the other hand, the knowledge of these would have been highly inconvenient; since it must have raised a contempt for the low and little System of the Law, which men, raised to so much higher hopes and expectations, would never condescend to submit to.

If they had been trained up under the Principles of the Patriarchal or Christian Religion, if they had been favoured with plain and clear Revelations of the Gospel Truths, and accustomed to behold the *image itself* in full Relief; must they not, of course, have had a very despicable opinion of that Dispensation, which presented nothing to their contemplation, but a few faint *outlines, Types, and Shadows*?

To suppose therefore with his Lordship, that the Teachers of the Law were all along commissioned to propagate and establish the hope of a spiritual Kingdom among the *Jews*; would be supposing they were commissioned to propagate a doctrine, which necessarily tended to lessen and debase the authority of the Law; and to encourage the spirit of

apostacy and revolt, to which the People were of themselves, without such encouragement, extremely prone.

It appears then, that the *temporal* and *spiritual* Covenants would have been so far from being subservient to the establishment and support of each other; that, had they been revealed together in the order his Lordship's System supposes, they must have had a quite contrary effect. Indeed, nothing can be more derogatory to all our ideas of divine wisdom, than to imagine; that two such dispensations were delivered together, as would have mutually tended to impair and defeat one another's influence.

Thus the System, which pretends that these two Covenants were delivered together; is, like many other Systems, inconsistent with the nature both of God and Man. The nature of God will not permit us to suppose; that he would, at the same time, appoint two different Religions; calculated to counteract, and mutually to defeat the operations of each other. The state and condition of the human mind will not suffer us to believe; that the same Persons could be fitted to receive the *rudiments* and *elements* of the Law, and,

at



at the same time, *the doctrine of perfection*, revealed in the Gospel.

To proceed, As this learned Prelate makes the Abrahamic and the Christian Covenant the same, he must suppose; that God *first* revealed the universal Religion, or the religion intended for the use of all mankind; and *afterwards* deliver'd a partial one, confined to a single nation. And as the particular nation, appointed to be the depositary of those divine oracles, which contain the promise of redemption and a future state, was to be kept separate and distinct from all others; we must suppose, that Providence designed to limit and restrain this universal Religion, and to keep it from the knowledge of all other people, at this time. But is it not absurd to suppose, that an universal Religion should be revealed under such circumstances, as would necessarily limit and restrain it, and permit only one small and inconsiderable people to come to the knowledge of it?

Good reasons may be assigned, why a mere preparatory system should be confined to a single people: But what good reason can be given, why an universal Religion should be limited and restrained in the same manner?

R 4

If

If the Abrahamic Covenant was the same as the Christian, it must have included *all the nations of the world*: And if an *universal* Covenant had been already given, what occasion could there have been for the Jewish *Laws of separation*; or why was a *Wall of partition* erected under a Religion, which was declared to be common to all nations?

An universal Kingdom, and Laws of separation, seem to me things evidently incompatible. How is it possible to imagine, that God should design to erect an universal Kingdom; and yet, should annex and prescribe such terms of admission, as would necessarily shut almost all the nations of the world out of it? (a)

His

(a) A late writer, in an *Essay concerning the abolishing of the Ceremonial Law*, says; “When the *spiritual Kingdom* took place, which was to be extended to “all Nations; — and when the substance came instead “of the shadow; — those laws of separation were no “longer proper; and therefore, instead of being taken “into, they were abolished by, this dispensation”. *Benson on the Epistle to Titus*, p. 104.

If we suppose then with my Lord Bishop, that this *new* and universal *Dispensation* was revealed, and had taken place in the patriarchal ages; we shall make these Laws as useless and improper in the time of *Moses*, as they would be even now.

His Lordship observes; " that the true Religion instituted by God has been *one* and " the *same*, from the Fall of *Adam*; subsisting ever upon the *same principles* of " *Faith*". (a) We must suppose then, that the Patriarchal Religion was built on Faith in the Redeemer of the World. If therefore the Law was added to administer and to dispense the hopes and promises of the Patriarchal System, it must have been added to administer and to dispense the promise of Salvation by Faith in the Redeemer of mankind; or, in other words, the promulgation of this doctrine must have been the great and primary end of the *Jewish* Institution.

And would not a System, whose promises were attached to *Works*, have been admirably calculated to promote and cultivate the doctrine of Salvation by *Faith*? — Wild and romantic as this account of the Law may appear, it is the necessary consequence of supposing, that the Patriarchal Religion taught the promise of salvation by *Faith* in the Redeemer of the world; and that the Law was added to dispense the doctrines, which had been previously revealed to the Patriarchs.

(a) P. 75.

The



The great points asserted by his Lordship are, that the Law was given to administer the hopes revealed to the Patriarchs; and that these were the hopes of eternal life by the Redeemer of mankind. — I must now observe 2dly, That the Old Testament affords no countenance to this hypothesis; as it never declares that the Law was given to perpetuate and preserve *these particular doctrines*, which his Lordship has assigned to the Patriarchal Religion.

We may oppose to his hypothesis not only the bare silence of the Old Testament; but likewise its *Typical* and *Figurative* Representations of the Gospel-doctrine. His Lordship observes, “ That the Jewish Religion did *virtually* contain the hopes of “ the Gospel; — and that the Jewish “ Church was founded to preserve, and to “ administer these hopes (a).” I shall readily allow, that the Jewish Religion did *virtually* contain these Hopes; *i. e.* did contain them in *Types* and *Figures*. But to suppose that a *Virtual*, *i. e.* a *Typical* or *Mystical* Representation of these hopes was given in order to ADMINISTER, and to DISPENSE them to the Jewish Church; seems just as natural

(a) P. 145, 6.

and

and reasonable, as it would be to suppose that clouds and mists were formed for the more quick and speedy propagation of Light.

The two Sentences therefore, which his Lordship has tacked together, are so far from serving to illustrate and explain, that they evidently contradict and subvert each other. If the Law contained these hopes *virtually*, i. e. *Typically* and *Mystically*, we may be certain it was not given to administer, and to dispense them to the Jewish people. On the other side, had it been given for this purpose, we may be as certain, that they would have been plainly and explicitly, and not *Mystically* or *Typically*, revealed by it.

I can see no reason, why the Deists should so eagerly oppose the notion of typical and secondary Prophecies; for if my Lord Bishop can get it believed, that they were made use of to convey such doctrines as the inspired writers were directed to publish and promulge; nothing will more contribute to expose sacred Scripture, and the authors of it to ridicule; than such a wanton and fantastic, such a capricious and perverse Abuse of these sort of Figures.

His Lordship has observed, that *Moses* was sent to revive the knowledge of the supreme  
Being

Being among the *Israelites*; who remembered nothing of his real nature and attributes (a). Accordingly we find, that the Supremacy of the one true God is plainly and clearly inculcated in every page of the Law. And if his promise of Redemption, and a future state, was to be revived at the same time; Why was it not inculcated in the same *plain, open, and explicate* manner?

3dly. His Lordship says, that the Jewish Religion contains *virtually*, i. e. in *Types* and *Figures*, the hopes of that life and immortality which had been revealed to the Patriarchs; and that the *Jewish Church* was founded to preserve, and to administer these hopes. But such a supposition seems to be contrary to the declaration of St. Paul; who speaks of Moses and the Prophets as being made Ministers of the *Letter*, and not of the *Spirit* (b). For their Commission must have extended beyond the Letter, if they preached the doctrine of Redemption and eternal life; which was the very Spirit of the Law, or the thing *virtually* contained in it.

According to the same Apostle, Moses was so far from administering this doctrine, or spe-

(a) Sermons, Vol. I. p. 286.

(b) 2 Cor. iii. 6, 7, 8, 9.



cifying and pointing out to his people the true end of the Law; that he cast a veil over his face, in order to hide and conceal it from them (a).

In his Epistles to the *Romans* and *Galatians*, he declares; that the promise of salvation by Faith in *Christ*, was not revealed under the Law (b). How then could the Jewish Church be founded to preserve, and to administer the hopes of this blessing?

The Apostle likewise confutes this doctrine; when he speaks of the scheme of our Redemption, as "The Wisdom of God in a *Mystery*; even the *bidden* Wisdom (c)". To which we may add the numerous passages cited in the first Chapter of this work, in which the Apostle declares that Christianity is a revealed *Mystery*, or contains a System of Salvation unknown and unpublished before the coming of the Saviour.

The Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* assures us, "That the way to Heaven was not made manifest under the Law;"—and he observes farther, that the Salvation proposed in the Gospel, "*Began First* to

(a) 2 Cor. iii. 13. (b) Romans vi. 14. Gal. iii. 23.

(c) 1 Cor. ii. 7, 4, 1.

"be spoken by Jesus Christ (a)." And is not either of these Positions sufficient to subvert and overthrow that hypothesis, which pretends, (in direct contradiction to the inspired writer,) that the way to Heaven was made manifest, and that the doctrine of Salvation had been all along propagated and dispensed, by Moses and the Prophets under the Law?

Let us add, that this hypothesis is not only discredited by the silence of the *old* Testament, and condemned by many plain and express texts of the *new*; but is likewise also inconsistent with several passages in his Lordship's *Sermons*, and in his *Discourses on Prophecy*. For he supposes, that the Law was given to administer the doctrines of the patriarchal Religion; and among these, he ranks the principle of the *Resurrection*, as having been revealed about the time of the flood, or in the age of *Job*. His hypothesis therefore supposes, that the doctrine of the Resurrection was to be administered and dispensed by the Law. And yet the avowed purpose of his *Sixth Sermon* is to prove, that this very doctrine was reserved for the preaching of *Jesus*.

(a) 1 Cor. ii. 3, 9, 4.

As



As his Lordship contends, that the promise of Redemption was revealed in the patriarchal ages; his hypothesis supposes, that this doctrine was to be taught and dispensed by the Law. And yet in his *Third* Sermon he assures us, "That it is called a *Mystery* (a), "because it was kept secret since the world "began; God not having opened or declared "his gracious purposes before the coming of "*Christ*". And will the learned Prelate say, that the Law was given to propagate a doctrine; which was to remain a *Mystery*, and not to be opened or disclosed before the coming of our Saviour?

"The publication of the Gospel (says his Lordship) has made an alteration in the "Scheme of Religion; *by* revealing to us "the Son of God".

"The knowledge of the Son of God, of "his power and dominion in the *creating* "and upholding all things, became necessary; as the Foundation of the Faith required to be placed in him as our Redeemer. The Character of Redeemer would "be but ill supported by any person, who "had not power equal to the great Un-

(a) Sermons, Vol. I. p. 132.

"dertaking.



“dertaking. The New Testament doctrines  
 “therefore, relating to the dignity and au-  
 “thority of Jesus Christ, are relative to his  
 “Office of Redeemer; and therefore there  
 “was no explicit declaration of them either  
 “before or under the Law of *Moses (a)*”.

His Lordship's hypothesis supposes, that the doctrine of Redemption had been revealed to the Patriarchs; and was to be administered and dispensed by the Law. But he now informs us, that the Character and Office of Redeemer could be but ill supported; unless the *dignity* and *authority*, relative to it, had been revealed with it; and he informs us also, that these were reserved to be revealed in the Gospel. And would he have us at the

(a) Sermons, Vol. I, p. 73.

His Lordship assures us, that the famous Text in *Job* (*I know that my Redeemer liveth, &c.*) is a *strong* prophecy of the *Character* and *Office* of *Jesus*, considered as the Redeemer of mankind. But he now informs us in his *Sermons*, that this Character and Office could be but ill supported; unless the Dignity and Authority, relative to it, had been revealed with it; and he informs us also, that these were reserved for the Gospel. Thus this *strong* Prophecy was so *weak*, that it was unable to support the Character and Office foretold by it; or to establish the required Faith in the Messiah, as the Redeemer of mankind.

same

same time believe, that the Patriarchal Religion and the Law, required men to place their Faith in the Redeemer; while his Character was but ill supported, or he did not appear adequate to his Office ?

His Character and Office must have been originally revealed with no other view, than to invite men to place their trust in him, considered as their Redeemer. Accordingly my Lord Bishop supposes, that the Redeemer was revealed to our first Parents; and that Faith in him was the Foundation of Religion, both in the ages before, and under, the Law. Thus the foundation of Religion was not competently supported in these ages; or, in other words, the Character of the Redeemer<sup>was</sup> not so fully opened and displayed; as the necessity of the times required.

In a word, If the knowledge of the power and dominion of the Son of God, as *Creator and Upholder* of all things, "*became necessary*, as the Foundation of the Faith required to be placed in him as our Redeemer;" it will follow, that this knowledge ought to have been revealed immediately after the Fall; since his Lordship holds, that the Redeemer had been set forth, and that men were required to place their

S Faith

Faith in him, from that time. Consequently, *explicit declarations* of the *Dignity* and *Authority*, relative to his office of Redeemer, were as seasonable in the ages before and under the Law; as in the times of the Gospel.

"The common-wealth of *Israel* (says his Lordship) was raised, and flourished under the temporal covenant given at first to *Noah*; and in a particular manner, with additional promises confirmed to *Abraham*, and his seed. For this reason all the promises and threatnings of the Law are *Temporal; suitable to the age and season of the world (a)*."

His Lordship's Hypothesis supposes; that the Law was given to administer the *spiritual* hopes and promises, which had been revealed to the Patriarchs: and yet here he assures us, that only *TEMPORAL promises and threatnings were suitable* to the age of the Law. His Hypothesis therefore must be strangely ill-imagined; which supposes the Law was appointed to dispense hopes and promises, *unsuitable to that age and season of the world*.—In the passage quoted just above, his Lordship contends; that the Law had no promises or threatnings, but what were tempo-

(a) P. 132.



ral; because no other were *suitable to that age and season*. And in the passage referred to here below, he affirms; that prophecies, relating to the temporal affairs of the *Jewish* people, were necessary under the Law; because the better hopes of futurity were not yet brought in (a). Now both these passages evidently imply, that the Law was *not* given to administer spiritual hopes and promises revealed to the Patriarchs.

It is strange his Lordship should suppose, that prophecies, relating to temporal affairs, were necessary to supply the absence and omission of *these very hopes*, which were to be administered by the Law. For this is supposing, that the Law did not answer the End of its institution; or did not administer and dis-

## S 2

pense

(a) “ You see now, upon what foot all the prophecies  
 “ in the old Testament stand, which relate to the tempo-  
 “ ral Concerns of the Jewish Nation; you see like-  
 “ wise the reason, why this kind of prophecy has ceased  
 “ in the Christian Church. The Gospel is not founded  
 “ on temporal promises. — The bringing in of better  
 “ hopes has vacated the promises of the Mosaic Cove-  
 “ nant; and ’tis expected of us, after so much light  
 “ given, that our Faith should be proof against the ad-  
 “ versities of the world; without the help of a prophet  
 “ to foretel, or to reveal to us, in every Instance, the  
 “ Counsel of God”. *Fifth Discourse*.

pense the doctrines which were to be administered and dispensed by it.

His Lordship observes; that, *about the time of the Captivity*, "God thought fit to give  
" more and plainer intimations of his purpose,  
" to establish the Kingdom of Righteousness;  
" than ever had been given before from the  
" days of *Adam*. Now it was that God  
" taught his people *plainly* to expect a *new*  
" Covenant; a better than that made with  
" their Fathers (a)."

According to his Lordship's system, this Christian Covenant had been revealed to the Patriarchs; and the Law was afterwards added in order to establish and preserve the hopes of it. And yet he here assures us, that God did not teach his people *plainly* to expect it, till about the Time of the Captivity. But surely they ought to have been *plainly* taught to expect it from the very first; and the *plain* Revelation of it should have been coeval with the Law, if indeed it was instituted for this use. Moses and the Prophets must have been sent to very little purpose, if it was so late before the People were plainly taught to expect what the Law had been originally instituted to teach; namely, this *better Covenant*.

(a) P. 151.

But his Lordship's Hypothesis, which supposes the Law given to preserve the spiritual hopes and promises of the christian covenant; a covenant, which had been previously revealed to the patriarchs; is inconsistent with other passages in his *discourses on prophecy*, already quoted. One of these informs us, that a plain and open exposition of these spiritual hopes and promises *would have carried the Jews beyond the bounds of knowledge prescribed by God to that age of the World.* (a) And will the learned Prelate say, that the Law was given to administer doctrines utterly disproportionate to the times in which they were delivered?

He observes too, that *these spiritual Blessings* were represented under the *image of temporal prosperity*; or put under a carnal veil and cover (b). But can we suppose the Law would put a Veil or Cover over doctrines, which were to be promulged and published by it?

His Lordship is but little content with the opinion of those Writers, who are content with what the Law represents of itself; namely that it was given to preserve the knowledge

(a) P. 129, 130.

(b) P.



of the one true God amongst the *Israelites*, whilst it was lost every where else (a). He rejects this, as too low and narrow a design; and maintains, that it was intended for higher purposes; and given to administer the like hopes with the christian Covenant. But instead of enobling the Law by

(a) The learned Dr Law, after other learned Doctors, and with a like purpose, namely to prove that the one God was publicly worshipped by the Pagans; observes, that they “ had no less than three hundred *Jupiters*; or *supreme Gods*. ” Considerations, p. 113.

The several Appellations of *Jupiter Ammon*, *Olympicus*, *Capitolinus*, &c. might have shewn him, that the many and different *Jupiters* were considered only as so many local and tutelar *Deities*. Had the Heathens therefore had three thousand *Jupiters* instead of three hundred, this would be no proof that they had one *supreme God*.

But, after all, who was it that spoke of these many and different *Jupiters*? Only the *Philosophers*; who, searching into the origin of the Pagan Theology, found that their good Kings and Benefactors had been worshipped under the name of *Jupiter*; and therefore regarded them as so many different *Jupiters*, i. e. as so many Kings, who had assumed his name. Thus the *philosophic History* had indeed many *Jupiters*; but the *popular Theology* had only one.

Now will the learned Doctor say, that the *Philosophers* had three hundred *supreme Gods*; because they had discovered, that the name of *Jupiter* was given to so many dead men?

For

[ by loading it with these new honours, he has only intangled it with fresh difficulties; and enabled prophane men to attack it with more vigour and success; by shewing that the nature of the two Dispensations, the authority of the two Testaments, and my Lord Bishop's own Concessions, are all directly inconsistent with this honourable Hypothesis (a).

For a full explanation of this point, I refer the Reader to the *D. L.* Vol. I. Part II. p. 37. *Fourth Edition.*

(a) Nor will the learned Dr Leland find his account of the *Jewish* Law less subject to the embarrassments, which perplex the System of the learned Prelate. For he holds, that it was given to revive the doctrines of the patriarchal Religion; which had been obscured and depraved, and even almost extinguished and defaced at that time. (b) And he contends also, that Redemption and a future State, were the principal of these doctrines. He may then, in his next *View of Deistical Writings*, if he so pleases, clap this book into the Number; and try, if he be so disposed, to remove the several Arguments advanced in this Chapter of it.

---

(b) View of the Deistical Writers.

## CHAP. V.

*Containing an Inquiry, How far the Doctrine advanced in my Lord Bishop's Sixth Sermon, affects the argument of the DIVINE LEGATION; How far it tends to establish the credit of MOSES, and the PROPHETS: And how far it is consistent with the other parts of his Lordship's theological System.*

THE Doctrine advanced in this Sermon, is; "That all the former Revelations had left the principle of a future state involved in doubts and obscurities, or embarrassed with difficulties and uncertainties; which were to be illustrated and made plain by Jesus Christ." (a) Now all these doubts and obscurities, these difficulties and uncertainties, are supposed to arise from the want of the knowledge of the RESURRECTION; which his Lordship supposes necessary, to fix and establish men in the full

(a) This is asserted in the five first pages, 187—191.



full persuasion and belief of a future life. (b)

Consistently with this doctrine he can assign to no prior System of Religion whatsoever, any *clear* and *evident* revelation of a future state. The necessary consequence of this, is; that it was not intended for the SANCTION of *any* prior System of Religion. For had it been intended for the Sanction of the *Patriarchal* and *Jewish* Dispensations, it ought to have been revealed before and under the Law, with the utmost clearness and precision; or such a degree of light and evidence, as would have been sufficient to dispel all doubts and uncertainties concerning it. It ought at least to have been delivered with so much clearness and precision, as to leave no room to doubt, whether it was revealed in the *Patriarchal* and *Jewish* Religions.

“The great advantage the World has  
 “over Religion, (says his Lordship) lies in  
 “the *Certainty* and *Reality* of its objects;  
 “which flow in upon us at every sense. To  
 “supply this defect on the part of Religion,  
 “Revelation was given to assure us  
 “of the *certainty* and *reality* of THINGS FUTURE;  
 “without which assurance they could  
 “have

"have no effect or influence on our affections." (a)

Here his Lordship supposes, that nothing but a full persuasion and assurance of a *future state*, unimpaired by any mixture of suspicion and doubt, could be sufficient to establish and support the Interests of Religion. Now as he asserts, that no such assurance and persuasion could be derived from the Revelations which were vouchsafed to the *Patriarchal* and *Jewish* Churches; I would beg leave to ask, how this deficiency was supplied; or what particular dispensation of Providence was made use of, to preserve Religion, without affording any perfect assurance, or full persuasion of a *future Life*?

If any such administration of Providence, was really exercised; what have his Lordship, or his Followers, to object to the Arguments of the *D. L.*? If no such administration of Providence was exercised, why did not the ancient Revelations give evident proof and demonstration of the certainty of a *future Life*; instead of leaving it clouded and enveloped with the doubts and obscurities complained of?

As his Lordship contends, that nothing less than a perfect assurance of the certainty

(a) Serm. Vol. I. P. 395.

tainty and reality of another life, can have any effect and influence on our affections, or be sufficient to move the springs of action; He must own, that, with regard to their *practical* influence, there was no material difference between a dark and uncertain Revelation, which did not afford such assurance; and *no* Revelation of a *future state*, at all.

To elude the Argument of the *D. L.*, we must suppose, that the *Jewish* Revelation afforded a clear and perfect assurance of the *certainty* and *reality* of another Life. Now as the doctrine of his Lordship's Sermon will not permit us to make such a supposition; it will not permit us to oppose this argument. (a) Whatever therefore his Followers may suggest, we shall find it a little difficult to persuade ourselves, that the subversion of the argument of the *D. L.* was the

(a) It has been observed in another place, that the Concessions of most other Writers, as well as those of my Lord Bishop and Dr Stebbing, are sufficient to establish the Argument of the *divine Legation*. For that they assign the *Jewish* Revelations only such *faint* and *obscure* notices of a future state, as would not be sufficient to support Religion without the Administration of an extraordinary Providence. See *The Argument of the D. L.* P. 91. 2, 3. P. 15. 4, 5. note.

principal



principal thing aimed at, either in the *writing*, or the *publication* of this Sermon.

We shall be the less disposed to entertain any suspicion of this kind; if we consider, that the doctrine advanced in this Discourse, tends rather to embarrass and perplex, than to relieve and assist, the Writers against the *divine Legation*.

His Lordship supposes, that the Principle of a *future state* was necessary to support Religion; and he supposes also, that the knowledge of the *Resurrection*, was necessary to support the principle of a future State. Thus he ingrafts the new principles of the Resurrection upon the old System. For, according to his Lordship, the doctrine of a future State, without this Addition, would have been perfectly useless and insignificant; having no firm and independent bottom of its own, to stand upon.

Had he condescended to examine the arguments offered in the *D. L.*; or had he but reflected, how poorly and contemptibly his Followers have supported their opposition; he would have found no great encouragement to affirm, even that a *future state* had been revealed to the *Jewish Church*. But to pretend that the article of the *Resurrection*  
*should*

*should* or *ought* to have been revealed too, will heighten and increase the difficulties; which before were great enough in conscience.

The more sober writers against the *D. L.* attempt no more than to shew, that a future state had been revealed to the *Jews*. But his Lordship now tells them, that they have mistaken the point in Question; and misemployed their time and pains. For that the argument requires them to prove, that the Article of the *Resurrection* was revealed together with the doctrine of a future state; since the last could have no solid establishment or support, and consequently no influence, without the first. However (what is most to be lamented) he assures them, at the same time, that this neither has, nor ever can be proved (a);

(a) Here we may observe, that my Lord Bishop will afford the Deists great advantages; if he shall argue with them on the supposition that a future state was necessary to support the Religion of the ancient *Jews*. For on this supposition, they will tell him, that it should have been plainly and expressly delivered; and if the *Resurrection* was necessary, to ascertain the doctrine of futurity; the *Resurrection* also ought to have been as clearly and distinctly revealed in the old Testament, as in the new. Since his Lordship therefore confesses, that the *Jewish* System had no such Revelation; he gives up its Title to a divine Original.



as the *Resurrection*, was reserved to be revealed in the Gospel. And is not this telling them, that the Argument of the *D. L.* is actually impregnable, and superior to all their Efforts?

In this Sermon his Lordship maintains, that the Knowledge of the Resurrection was necessary to establish the doctrine of a future state,

We have observed (p. 60.) that Dr. *Law's* notion concerning the SLEEP OF THE SOUL, will oblige him to suppose that no doctrine of a future state, but that of the *Resurrection*, could possibly be revealed to the ancient *Jews*. His Embarrassment therefore will be very great, if he should engage to support their Religion against Unbelievers, on the Supposition that a future state was, or ought to have been revealed to them.

For 1<sup>st</sup>. In order to prove that there are no rewards and punishments between Death and the Resurrection, he has given up many passages commonly alledged to shew, that the *Jews* had the knowledge of a future state. (Appendix, p. 367.)

2<sup>dly</sup>. As he has deprived himself of these Texts, he is confined to such only as speak of the *Resurrection*; and it will be incumbent on him to prove that *this* doctrine was revealed, and intended for the Sanction of the *Jewish* Religion. If it was intended for this purpose, it ought to have been as plainly and explicitly revealed in the books of *Moses*, as in those of the new Testament. The Doctor therefore must either point out such plain and explicit Revelations of a *resurrection* in the Pentateuch; or leave Unbelievers in possession of the Argument.



state; which could have had no competent Foundation, or proper influence and force, without it. In this very Sermon he declares, likewise, that the principle of the *resurrection* was not discover'd before the coming of our Saviour. Either therefore, there had been no Religion before this; or a Religion, which subsisted exclusively of the doctrine of a future state. [p. 378]

As to the Text, which declares that Jesus Christ *brought life and immortality to light*; it is of no importance, whether his Lordship acquiesces in Dr. Warburton's Interpretation, or whether he produces another; since that other implies every thing that need be asked to establish the argument of the *D. L.* For if his Lordship's Interpretation does not ascribe to *Jesus Christ* the original discovery of a future state; yet it ascribes to him the original discovery of *that circumstance*, without which a future state could have had no solid establishment; and consequently, no proper influence and effect on men's moral practice.

It is far from a wonder, that the Writers against the *D. L.* should have failed in their attempts to discredit and invalidate the great argument of the Book: But it may seem  
a little

a little strange, that their very Opposition should drive and force them upon such principles; as tend to establish and confirm it. This is evidently the case of Dr. Stebbing; who contends, that the Doctrine of a future state was delivered under Types in the Law; and contends also, that the doctrines thus delivered were purposely secreted and concealed. This too, I predict, will be the case of all who shall adopt the principle advanced in his Lordship's Sermon, in order to carry on the same wise and candid project.

But, to keep to our attendance on his Lordship, we are next to enquire, whether the Doctrine advanced in this *Sixth Sermon*, tends to strengthen the *Jewish* Revelation; or to establish the Credit and Authority of *Moses* and the *Prophets*.

His Lordship insists upon the natural argument for a future state, deduced from the unequal Distribution of things; and then adds, " But something farther seems necessary to give ease to Nature, in this painful search after life and happiness. The numberless instances of mortality, which we hear and see; the remains of those, who left the world ages before we came into it, and are still mouldering in their tombs,

" is undeniable evidence, that Death destroys  
 " this compound Being, which we call man.  
 " How to revive this union, Nature knows  
 " not; and as for those, who make the Spi-  
 " rits of men in the divided state to be per-  
 " fect men; they seem to have got a conclu-  
 " sion without consulting the premises." (a)  
 Alluding to this Observation in another  
 place, he says; " In this point then Na-  
 " ture seems to be lame, and not able to  
 " support the hopes of immortality which  
 " she gives to all her children." (b) Now  
 if this Ignorance of the re-union of Soul  
 and Body would " occasion misgivings of  
 " mind, would tempt men to mistrust this  
 " future Judgment, and would disable na-  
 " ture from supporting the Hopes of Im-  
 " mortality, which she gives to all her chil-  
 " dren;"

If this, I say, be true; then the doctrine of  
 the *Re-union* of these two Substances, must  
 have made part of the *original* Revelation of  
 a future state. For wherever a future state  
 was revealed, it must have been revealed  
 with a design to clear up the doubts and  
 obscurities, which the feeble light of Na-

(a) P. 85, 86. Serm. Vol. I.

(b) P. 205. Serm.

Vol. I.



ture was unable to expel. And these, if we may believe his Lordship, arose entirely from the want of the knowledge of this *Re-union*.

If the great difficulty, at which Nature stumbled, was not perfectly removed, the Truths of Religion would not have gained any new strength, nor the practice of it have received any improvement, by a Revelation.

It would highly disgrace and discredit this Revelation, to suppose that it left the notion embarrassed with the principal difficulties in which it was originally involved. For in this case it would have revealed just nothing; that is, it would have been equivalent to no Revelation at all.

According to his Lordship, the doctrine of this *Re-union*, or the Resurrection, was the single point wanting to perfect and complete the *natural* Argument for a future life; and therefore was the only circumstance, which made a Revelation on this Subject necessary. (a) To suppose therefore a Revelation

(a) It has been censured as extravagant and absurd in Lord *Bolingbroke*, to speak so highly and honourably as he does, of *natural Religion*; and yet to deny it the Sanction of a future state. On the other hand, Dr. *Law* observes; that "The hopes of  
Futurity

velation of a future state, which said nothing of this *Resurrection*; or resurrection; would be supposing a Revelation, which said nothing of the great point which *should* or *ought* to have been revealed.

Is it not therefore more for the credit of the *Jewish* Revelation, to suppose, that it said nothing of a future state, when it did not want it; than that it said nothing to the purpose, when it did?

The Lordship insists upon it, that the notion of immortality and a future Judgment, which supposes only the Existence of the Soul, "could never serve the ends and purposes of Religion, because it is a notion, which the Generality of mankind can never

"Futurity are the Basis of all natural Religion." And yet he says, "many of the Heathens contended, that "Death put a period to their whole Existence, and "none, as we have seen, had ground sufficient to convince them of the contrary." Considerations, p. 240—

337. Natural Religion must have been very oddly constituted, if the wisest Heathens were not able to discover the Basis on which it was erected; and consequently had no proper encouragement to practise the duties enjoined by it. An imperfect or insufficient promulgation of its sanctions, must be an eternal blemish and dishonour to the natural Law. So that if the

“ never arrive at. Go to the Villages, and  
 “ tell the Ploughmen; that, if they sin, yet  
 “ their Bodies shall sleep in peace; no ma-  
 “ terial, no sensible Fire shall ever reach  
 “ them; but there is something within  
 “ them, purely intellectual, which shall suf-  
 “ fer to eternity; you will hardly find, that  
 “ they have enough of the intellectual to  
 “ comprehend your meaning. Now natu-  
 “ ral Religion is founded on the sense of  
 “ nature; that is, upon the common ap-  
 “ prehensions of mankind.” I would ask  
 then, what notion of a future state was  
 preached up by *Moses* and the *Prophets*,  
 when they addressed themselves to the body  
 of the *Jews*; who seem to have had as  
 scanty a share of the *intellectual*, as most  
 other people. If they informed the People of  
 the *Re-union* of soul and body, they would  
 have anticipated the office of our Lord;  
 and have left nothing to be *brought to light*  
 by him, even on the learned Prelate’s own in-

noble Lord derogates from the supposed *absolute*  
*perfection* of natural Religion, when he denies it the  
 Sanction of a future state; the learned Doctor even  
 derogates from its *relative perfection*, when he con-  
 tends that its sanction was not discoverable by its Fol-  
 lowers.



terpretation of this phrase. If they did not inform them of this *Re-union*, their preaching the doctrine of immortality and a future Judgment must have been absolutely vain, in his Lordship's opinion; since the People would never have been influenced by them, or ever *able to comprehend their meaning*. They could only have uttered a heap of unintelligible words; which must have been as mere Jargon to the ancient *Jews*, as the Dreams and Visions of *Jacob Behmen* are to us.

Is it not more for the credit of *Moses* and the *Prophets*, to suppose that they were to say nothing at all of a future state; than that they were to say nothing of it, but what was absolutely ineffectual and utterly unintelligible?

If no notion of future punishments, but such as were *material* and *sensible*, could have any effect on the People; it will follow, that the popular Description of future punishments should have occurred in the Law, as well as in the Gospel; and that *the Lake, which burneth with Fire and Brimstone*, should have been as plainly and clearly mentioned by *Moses* and the *Pro-*

phets, as by Jesus Christ, and by his Apostles (a).

(a) A late Author undertakes to explain, why the poetical Writers of the Old Testament say nothing of the state of good and bad men after death.

Quod si eos locos omnes exutimus, quibus sacri vates Inferos ornatu poetico describunt. — Nullam ibi animarum immortalium Descriptionem, aut explicatam admodum factam mentionem reperiemus; non eo quod perierint animos post mortem non crederent, quod doctis quibusdam placuit; sed quod nec ullam haberent satis claram eorum notionem, et intelligentiam, unde ubi et quales essent explicarent; neque eam adepti essent Sermonis et Argumentationis subtilitatem, ut de rebus abstrusis et a sensu omnino remotis probabiliter dicere, & eruditam disputationem suae ignorantiae praeferre possent. Qualis itaque ab animis a corpore sejunctis vita viveretur, quis eorum locus, forma, conditio, Hebraei juxta cum cæteris mortalibus in summa ignorance versabantur. Neque eos, hac in parte, vel minimum sacri Codices adjuvare, haud quia hanc cognitionem INVIDERET divina Revelatio, sed quia humanae mentis conditio eam omnino non recipiat: quæ cum res a corpore & materia remotas contemplatur, propriarum notionum inopia cogitur ad improprias confugere, & corporeis incorporea quadantenus adumbrare. Cum itaque viderent corpora vita functa in terram cadere, eoque modo quo dictum est sepulchro condi, percrebuit apud Hebræos, ut apud cæteros etiam, opinio quædam popularis, sub terra reliquam vitam agere mortuorum; quam ut adsciscerent vates sacri etiam necesse

It seems not entirely consistent in his Lordship, to affirm that no notion of a future

celle erat, si modo de hac re omnino loqui et intelligi vellent.

*Louth's Prælectiones Academicæ. P. 64, 65.*

— Non eo quod permanere animos post mortem NON CREDERENT; quod *doctis quibusdam* placuit. I would not willingly suppose, the Author of the *D. L.* is here *squinted* at; because he is so far from asserting this opinion, that he asserts the direct contrary; and yet, notwithstanding his own plain and express Declaration, some Writers have been profligate enough to charge him with this Doctrine. He talks, indeed, of somebody who holds, — *banc iis cognitionem INVIDERET divina Revelatio.* But this is only, what men call, and what Critics like him use, an expression *ad invidiam.*

Nullam ibi animorum immortalium *descriptionem*, aut *explicate admodum factam mentionem* reperiemus. Here he supposes, that the sacred Writers not only omit giving a *description* and *particular* account of future rewards and punishments; but that they never so much as mention them in plain and express terms. But, Why not mention them in plain and express terms? What hindered them from declaring, in so many words, that good men were to enjoy a state of everlasting happiness in Heaven; and the wicked were to be consigned to future punishments? The reason, produced by the learned person, seems to be short and wide of his purpose. He observes, that neither the People, nor their Teachers, had faculties proper to comprehend Ideas taken from the things *spiritual*; or to understand the *particular* and *precise* nature of these



ture life, but one that taught the post-existence of the Body, could be adapted to the service

future rewards and punishments. Admit they had not. This holds only against a *particular* and *descriptive*, but extends not to a *plain, express, and general* account of the state and condition of good and bad men after death.

My Lord *Bolingbroke* pretends; that a *simple, general, and undefined* Denunciation of future Punishments, would have been more for the honour of Revelation (*a*); than such a *particular and descriptive* account, as is given of them by *Jesus Christ* and his Apostles; who represent them under the image of a *Lake burning with Fire*. Here then let the learned Professor tell us, why future punishments might not have been exhibited under the same *sensible and material* Image in the Old Testament. To say the Imagery was improper, would be arraigning *Jesus Christ* and his Apostles; and saving the honour of the Law, at the Expence of the Gospel. It would indeed be confirming the objection which the noble Lord brought against the Gospel Doctrine of another life. On the other hand, if such *material and sensible* images were not improper in the Gospel; why might they not have been used in the Old Testament? For surely the gross and carnal constitution of the Law, did not require a more pure medium of conveyance; than the *spiritual* one of the Gospel.

As to the doctrine of future Punishments, we must recollect; that the *Jews* were men of gross imaginations and carnal appetites. Now a *general undefined* Denunciation of Hell, would not have had force enough to make the necessary impression on persons thus disposed;

---

(a) V. 5. P. 187.

service of Religion; and yet to affirm that this article of the *Re-union* of the Soul and

posed; or on a sensual fancy agitated by Fear (a). Any account therefore of future punishments, which did not grow *particular* and *descriptive*, would have had very little influence.

To suppose therefore with the learned Writer, that the notion of future punishments was revealed; and yet not revealed under *sensible* and *material* images, would be supposing that the Revelation was intended to be of no real use or significancy. And, *material* and *sensible* images, which were so well adapted to the hearers, were no less natural to the Speakers. For the question is about the *poetical Writers* of the old Testament. And what should make that language suit the Hebrew Poets so ill, which, he shews us, in this very page, fitted the Roman Poet so well? —

Infernas referet sedes, et regna recludat

Pallida, Dis invisa; superque immane barathrum

Cernatur, trepidentque immisso lumine Manes.

But, he seems to imagine; that the sacred Writers, were not to make use of *material* and *sensible* images, when they were speaking of things *spiritual*; or to say any thing but what was strictly true according to the Letter. Whence then is it, that they so often speak of the *Out-stretched Arm*, and the *All-seeing Eye* of God; and adopt other *metaphorical* and *figurative* Expressions, which, according to the literal signification, are abominable and impious.

How can we suppose that any other *spiritual* subject would have been dishonoured by *Metaphorical* and

Pl-

---

(a) View of L. Bolingbroke's Philosophy, Letter Ist.  
P. 53.



and Body was reserved to be revealed by Jesus Christ. Surely the publication of a circumstance,

*Figurative Expressions; if the supreme Being was not?*

The learned Writer maintains; that not only a future state, but the doctrine of the Resurrection, had been revealed to the ancient Jews (*a*). And to what purpose was it revealed, but to be taught and inculcated by the public Ministers of Religion? Why therefore do they not invite men to Obedience by the promise of an *Inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, reserved in the Heaven*; and by the Prospect of a *Crown of Glory*, which God had prepared for those that love him? And why also did they not inform them, that the Body “was sown in weakness, and raised in power; was sown in corruption, and raised in Glory; was sown a natural Body, and raised a spiritual Body”? It is as natural to look for such Declarations in the *old* as in the *new* Testament; on the supposition that the doctrine of the Resurrection, and a future state, was revealed to the ancient Jews.

Cum itaque viderent corpora vita functa in terram cadere, eoque modo quo dictum est sepulchro condi; percrebuit apud Hebræos, ut apud cæteros etiam, Opinio quedam popularis, *sub terra reliqua vitam agi mortuorum*; quam ut adsciscerent vates sacri etiam necesse erat, si modo de hac re omnino loqui et intelligi vellent.

The opinion which supposed *sub terra* reliquam vitam agi mortuorum, is inconsistent with the notion of the Resurrection. And can we believe, with this learned person, that the sacred Writers would have been obliged to adopt a popular opinion, which, according to him, contradicted a revealed doctrine? Cer-

---

(*a*) Persuasissimum erat animos non interire, et corpora etiam in vitam esse reditura; p. 63.



cumstance necessary to be known in the very first ages, should not have been deferred to the last.

It is certainly by the Light of Nature.

Certainly they would not have encouraged good men in the persuasion that their future Life was to be spent in *some subterraneous Region*; but have pointed out the *Growth of Glory*, and the *Inheritance incorruptible, undefiled*, which was reserved for them in *Heaven*. Nor would they have suffered them to continue in the belief, that their Bodies were to decay and moulder in the grave, without assuring them that they were to rise again; that they were sown in *weakness and corruption*, in order to be raised in *Power and Glory*?

It would have been very extraordinary indeed, if the people had been permitted to retain their old gross notions; after more pure and spiritual ones had been revealed for their instruction and use.

But let us consider in what manner the sacred writers accommodate themselves to the vulgar Conceptions of a future state. *David* declares, that the best men, after death, were to go into a place of *Silence and Purgativeness*; and to receive no further instances of the divine favour (a). We are told too, that the righteous after this life "were to dwell in a Land of darkness, " and of the shadow of death, without any order, and " where the Light is as darkness (b)." And here, let us observe, in opposition to this learned Author; that the sacred writers do sometimes speak *plainly and explicitly* of

(a) See as above, c. i. p. 56. &c.

(b) Job x. 20, 21, 7, 7 and 5.

It has been said, Only *faint* and *obscure* Revelations of a future state were necessary, because the doctrine might be sufficiently ascertained by the Light of Nature.

And, the state and condition of men after death. For they declare that they "are to dwell in the Land of *Darkness*, "and to go into the place of *Silence* and *Forgetfulness*."

And will he say, that in these Expressions they accommodate themselves to the *vulgar* conceptions of a future state? If they do, how can he pretend that the *Jewish* notion of a futurity makes any thing against the doctrine of the *D. L.*?

In his 13<sup>th</sup> Chapter *de Mystica Allegoria*, he affirms that many ancient prophecies have two senses; "one plain and literal, the other *mystical* and *recondite* (a). And he speaks of these prophecies, as appointed to convey *Mysteria*; or such doctrines as were to be secreted at this time.

Now as the doctrine of life and immortality was one of the Subjects conveyed under these *typical* and *secondary* prophecies, it must, on his own principles, have been a *Mystery*, during the period in question.

(a) *Sensum literalem et Mysticum vocant. — Ita ut quæ alteram exprimunt sensu aperto, proprio, historica accepta, alteram sensu recondito, interiore ac prophetico adumbrent, p. 96.*

*Allegoria Mystica — nimirum eventus sic describit plane, ut convenit vaticinationibus, recondite, involute, ac latenter; p. 100.*

And, on the same principle, might they not say, that nothing more than faint and obscure Revelations of the *Unity* and *Supremacy* of the true God, was necessary; because these Attributes may be sufficiently established on the grounds of natural Reason alone?

We are here presuming to argue with the learned Prelate; who holds, that this doctrine could not be sufficiently ascertained by the Light of nature, for want of the knowledge of the Resurrection. He must suppose, therefore, that *plain* and *clear* Revelations, were necessary. And the Question is, Why he supposes only *faint* and *obscure* ones were given; when, on his own principles, *plain* and *clear* ones were wanted?

It seems something extraordinary, his Lordship should hold that this doctrine was left involved in *doubts* and *obscurities*; when, at the same time, he holds, that God's *Covenant* of life and immortality had been revealed to our first parents; and afterwards to *Abraham*. He contends too, that the sole end of revealing the *Covenant*, was to acquaint men with the promise of life and immortality (a).

(a) Discourse 3d. p. 61, 66, 73.

And



And can we believe, that the *sole* point which was to be revealed, would have been given involved in such *obscure* and *obscure* *scriptures*, as to leave men *uncertain* whether there was any such thing as *life and immortality*, or no?

According to his Lordship, the Knowledge of this life and immortality was absolutely necessary, as being the *only* thing which could effectually encourage the Obedience of men, and make them *even* capable of any Religion (a). And is it not incredible, that God would spread Clouds and Darkness, round a doctrine, which was revealed for so high and important an end? (b)

There is something very extraordinary in the different accounts which his Lordship has given of the Revelations of this Covenant. In his second Dissertation, p. 238, he maintains, that God's *promise* of life and immortality was known to *Job, Abraham, (c),* and others, but that his *Covenant* of life and immortality was reserved for the teaching of *Je-*

(a) Discourses on prophecy, p. 64, 65, 66, 73.

(b) See Chapter 1, p. 76, 80.

(c) My Lord Bishop supposes, that *Abraham* had the Know-

*Jesus Christ*. Here he supposes, that *one half* of the Covenant, or the Terms and Conditions required on the part of Man, had not been revealed before the publication of the Gospel. And he now asserts in his *Sermons*, that *the other half*, or the life and immortality promised on the part of God, was clouded with *doubts* and *obscurities*; till the arrival of the same period. Thus God intended to reveal this Covenant in the more early ages of the world, and yet left half of it quite unpublished; and published the other part so encumbered with the *doubts* and *obscurities* above-mentioned, as made it a revelation to no purpose (a).

As Knowledge of God's *promise*; but not of his COVENANT of life and immortality. And if we ask, from whence his Lordship collects all this; he refers us to the prophecy which declares, "That all the nations of the Earth were to be blessed in his Seed". Which, yet he assures us, is the same with God's COVENANT of Immortality. Disc. 5th and 6th.

(a) Our first Parents were informed, that *the Seed of the woman should bruise the Serpent's Head*. It may be said, that his Lordship's interpretation of these words supposes that they convey a *clear knowledge* of life and immortality. Be it so. But does not he give up this interpretation, in his *sixth* Sermon; where he affirms, that the doctrine was left involved in *doubts* and



As the principle of a future state is of so great importance to Religion, it will be natural both for the Friends and Enemies of Revelation to ask; *How long* it was suffer'd to lie involved in these difficulties and uncertainties? His Lordship says, it was thus clouded and obscured for a *long period*; or from the time of the Fall to the publication of the Gospel.

" It may be worth inquiring, how Nature comes to be thus defective in this material point. Did not God intend men originally for Religious Creatures? And, if he did, is it not reasonable to expect an original and consistent scheme of Religion? which yet in the point

" now *obscurities*, embarrassed with *difficulties* and *uncertainties*, notwithstanding the light of this prophecy? Does he not give up this interpretation, in his *third* Sermon; where he declares, that not only the doctrine of the Resurrection, but even of a future state, was so far from being *clearly* revealed to our first parents; that it was all along a *Mystery*, which had been *kept secret since the world began*? Many other concessions of his Lordship, as well as most of the passages of the Old and New Testament, produced in the first Chapter of this Work, might be urged; as equally destructive of this interpretation.



" now before us seems to be wanting (a)." He then proceeds to explain, how Nature came to be thus defective. And here he tells us, " The absurdity upon the common notion of immortality arises from the dissolution of the body at death; and the great difficulty upon the foot of nature is how to preserve the individuals for judgment, which are evidently destroyed by Death (b):" He observes also, that the original scheme of Religion, or the Religion of nature, did not provide for this difficulty; as *Death had not yet enter'd in*, or was no part of the state of nature. (c).

This may indeed shew, that the original Scheme of Religion, *before the Fall*, was consistent; though it did not provide for this difficulty. But what was to be done, when *Death coming in*, made a

(a) Sermons Vol. I. P. 205.

(b) P. 206. Dr. Law agrees with my Lord Bishop, in maintaining that men could have no rational and consistent notion of a future state, without the knowledge of the Resurrection. (Considerations, p. 328.)

Now as he will own, that this Knowledge is not to be had by the light of reason; he must deny natural Theology the sanction of another life. And yet he assures us; (p. 240.) that " the hopes of futurity are the Basis (i. e. the Sanction) of all natural Religion.

(c) P. 207.

U

breach

breach upon the state of nature, and the old notion of immortality grew *absurd*?

“ God made man (says his Lordship) im-

“ mortal, and gave him consistent hopes and

“ fears: Man made himself mortal by sin:

“ Must not then those hopes, which were

“ consistent hopes upon the foot of immor-

“ tality, become *very absurd*; when joined

“ to a state of mortality (a) ?

But did not God intend men for reli-

gious Creatures, as well *after* as *before* the

Fall ? And if so, was not a *consistent* scheme

of Religion as necessary *after* this period, as

it had been before ?

If the reasonable hopes of immortality, en-

tertained before the Fall, became *very absurd*

and *inconsistent* afterwards, and yet were the

only support of Religion; ought not some new

provision to have been made for it ?

It seems but little for the honour of Provi-

dence, to say; that the original scheme of

Religion, before the Fall, was consistent;

if this consistency was broke in upon and

destroyed so early, (some Divines think, al-

most immediately) and not restored till the

age of the Gospel. It seems strange that his

Lordship, who speaks so highly of natu-

ral

(a) P. 207.

ral Religion, should yet contend that, after the Fall, there never was, nor ever could be, any consistent scheme of it.

As *Death* was no part of the state of nature, so the difficulties arising from it were not provided for in the Religion of nature. To remove these, was the proper work of Revelation; these our Saviour has effectually cleared by his Gospel (a). But they ought to have been cleared long before: The proper time of doing this commenced immediately after the Fall, or as soon as ever things suffered such a change, that no consistent Scheme of Religion could be formed without the removal of these difficulties (b).

By

(a) P. 207.

(b) It may be said, my Lord Bishop supposes that a consistent Scheme of Religion was given after the Fall; or that the knowledge of life and immortality was revealed to mankind in the prophecy, which declares that *the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head*. I have already observed, that his Lordship gives up this Interpretation in that part of his *sixth* Sermon, which affirms, that the doctrine of a future state was involved in doubts and obscurities, and embarrassed with difficulties and uncertainties, from the time of the Fall to the coming of our Saviour. I must observe likewise,



By deferring this Revelation to the age of the Gospel, his Lordship will be obliged to suppose, that no consistent scheme or system of Religion was offered to mankind, for the space of 4000 years. But is it not exposing Providence to the censure of Impiety, to suppose, that no proper and effectual Provision was made for the maintenance of Religion, during so long a Period?

Notwithstanding all this, his Lordship in the conclusion of his Sermon intimates, that this was indeed the case; for, speaking of the Christian Doctrine of the Resurrection, he says, " This Evidence of the Gospel  
 " has re-inflated nature in all her hopes,  
 " confirmed her right to Immortality, and  
 " taught her to triumph over Death and  
 " the Grave; which seemed before to be  
 " UNMOVEABLE BARS to all her Expectations. This has restored Religion, *which*  
 " before had hardly ONE SOUND FOOT to  
 " stand  
 that he gives up this Interpretation in that other Part of his sixth Sermon, which declares, that " Death  
 " and the Grave were *unmoveable* bars to all the (future) expectations of nature; and that Religion had  
 " hardly one sound foot to stand on, as Faith and Reason were at too great a distance to be consistent."

“ *stand on*; and made our FAITH and our  
 “ REASON CONSISTENT, which were be-  
 “ fore at *too great a Distance*. Nature in-  
 “ deed taught us to hope for Immortality,  
 “ but it was IN SPITE OF SENSE AND EXPE-  
 “ RIENCE, till the great Prince of our peace  
 “ appeared, who *brought life and immortali-*  
 “ *ty to light through the Gospel* (a).

It is here affirmed, we see, that Religion had hardly ONE SOUND FOOT to stand on, and “ that FAITH and REASON were at “ too great a distance to be consistent,” before the Revelation of the doctrine of *Life and Immortality, brought to Light through the Gospel*. But is it possible to conceive, that God had been giving a Series of Revelations from the beginning of the World, and yet that they were unavailable to reconcile *Faith and Reason*; our *Hopes* and our *Experience*? One of the Infidel Objections is, “ That no care was taken of Religion, from the time of the Fall to the publication of the Gospel; a Position indeed scarce more eagerly urged by the Author of *Christianity as old as the Creation*, than

(a) Sermons, Vol. 1, p. 209.

readily assented to by his Lordship in his *sixth* Sermon; which affirms, that no provision could be made for Religion, without communicating the knowledge of the Resurrection; and yet, that this knowledge was with-held; till the appearing of Jesus Christ.

His Lordship has observed, "That in  
" the more early ages of the world men  
" were acquainted with God, *personally* ac-  
" quainted with him, and knew his voice  
" when he spoke to them (a);" i. e. there  
was a constant intercourse between him  
and the sons of men, who thus received  
his Commands. He observes too, that  
God appeared manifestly, and oftentimes  
*miraculously* under the Law; or that a con-  
stant Series of Miracles was exhibited, in the  
administration of the Jewish Government (b).  
But to what End was all this profusion and  
waste of Miracles; if Religion all the time  
*had hardly a sound foot to stand on?* Or if it  
was thus poorly and despicably supported,  
what would be the issue of this constant  
blaze and display of the divine power, in

(a) P. 277. (b) Discourses on prophecy, p. 132, 134,  
149.



a continued series of miraculous interpositions; but to confound rather than to satisfy and instruct? One of Lord *Bolingbroke's* principal Objections to such an extraordinary providence, recorded in the old testament, is; that Religion was not sufficiently maintained and preserved by it (*a*). And does not my Lord Bishop plainly point out the *cause* to us; where he says, that *Faith and Reason were at too great a distance to be reconciled?*

Nothing revolts the Deists so much, as the long and numerous train of Miracles, recorded in the old Testament (*b*). And will they not be confirmed in their Prejudices, when we assure them that all this Expence was not sufficient to keep Religion on a tolerable foot, or enable it to answer the only End worthy the interposition of Providence?

Let us examine in the next place, whether the doctrine advanced in this Sermon be consistent with his Lordship's account of the *Jewish* and *Patriarchal* Revelations. One thing affirmed in the Sermon is, "That the Law afforded a *good* proof of a future life, when it declared that God was the God of

(*a*) V. 5. p. 48. (*b*) Middleton's Letters to Warburton, p. 481. Miscellaneous Tracts. Bolingbroke, Vol. 5. p. 343, 4. Octavo.

"*Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.*" Let us allow that it did afford such a Proof in this Declaration.

But in order to set Matters in their true Light, it will be necessary to premise these two things. 1<sup>st</sup>. His Lordship asserts, that the *Abrahamic* Covenant was founded on, or had the sanction of, eternal life (a). 2<sup>dly</sup>. That the *Legal* Covenant was founded on, or had no sanctions, but what were purely temporal (b). Now his interpretation of the passage above, concerning the *God of Abraham, &c.* will oblige him to identify these two Covenants; and to assign to each of them the same common sanction of a future state. " *That the dead are raised,*  
 " *even Moses shewed at the bush; when he cal-*  
 " *led the Lord the God of Abraham, and the*  
 " *God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.* From  
 " whence it appears, (says his Lordship) that  
 " our Saviour thought, that the Law of *Moses*  
 " afforded a good proof of a future Life. (c).  
 Now, if engaging to be the God of *Abra-*  
*ham, Isaac, and Jacob,* be understood to convey

(a) Discourse 5, 6.

(b) Discourses on prophecy, p. 101, 162, 3.

(c) Sermons, V. 1, p. 188.

the promise of a future life; the Law must have had the credit of this doctrine, in common with the *Abrahamic Covenant*. For it certainly was given in discharge and as the accomplishment of the promise, by which God had engaged to be the God of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*. "Ye stand this day  
 "all of you (says *Moses*) before the Lord your  
 "God — that thou shouldst enter into co-  
 "venant with the Lord thy God, and into  
 "his oath, which the Lord thy God maketh  
 "with thee this day; that he may establish  
 "thee to-day for a people unto himself, and  
 "that he may be unto thee a God, as he  
 "hath said unto thee; and as he hath sworn  
 "unto thy Fathers, to *Abraham, to Isaac,*  
 "*and to Jacob*" (a).

From hence it appears, that God engaged by the Law to be the God of the *Israelites*, in the very same sense in which he had engaged by the *Abrahamic Covenant*, to be the God of *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*. Now if this promise made the *Abrahamic* a SPIRITUAL Covenant, it must have made the Law a SPIRITUAL Covenant also; since it was as expressly contained in the one, as in the other.

(a) Deuteronomy, xxix. 10.



If this promise constitutes a *spiritual* Covenant, it must of course *spiritualize* the Law; and make it something more than a mere *temporal* Institution. It does not therefore seem very consistent in his Lordship to assert the *Spirituality* of the *Abrahamic* Covenant, in virtue of this promise; and yet to deny the *Spirituality* of the Law, founded on the very same promise (a).

This PROMISE seems indeed to identify the two Covenants; and to shew, that the last was only a repetition and renewal of the first. It will at least shew, that they were one and

(a) Dr. Stebbing too contends, that the Law neither had, nor could have, (b) any sanctions but what were temporal; and affirms also, that the *Abrahamic* covenant was establish'd on the promise of a future life (c).

Yet, he very zealously asserts, "That the *whole Substance* of the covenant made with *Abraham* is wrapt up "in this single Expression, that he would be *HIS GOD*" (d).

We have shewn, that this Expression, whatever distinction or privilege it may imply, belongs equally to the *Law* and to the *Abrahamic* Covenant. The Law therefore, on the Doctor's own principles, must have had the very *same substance*; i. e. the *same promises* with that Covenant.

---

(b) Examination, p. 35, 83, See p. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

(c) P. 25. (d) P. 86.

the same Covenant; so far as the promise of a future life is concerned. For by what rules of Criticism and Logic, or rather by what Magic and Inchantment, will any one be able to shew, that the phrase of being the God of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, must necessarily be confined to a *spiritual* sense in the book of *Genesis*, and to a *temporal* one in the book of *Deuteronomy*?

My Lord *Bolingbroke* asserts, that a future state is neither revealed in the patriarchal Dispensation, nor the Law (a). My Lord Bishop denies this position, as to the *Patriarchal*; but condescends <sup>to admit it</sup> as to the *Legal*, <sup>Covenant.</sup> And yet, in order to establish his distinction, he produces a passage belonging equally to the two Covenants, which most certainly either assigns a future state to both or to neither of them.

He assures us, "That the Law affords a good proof of a future life". If we ask where it affords this proof, he refers us to the passage which declares that *God was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*. Now if these words are a good proof that the Law taught a future state, they are just as good a proof that a future state was the Sanction of the

(a) V. 5. p. 151, 152, 8vo.

Law; and that it had the same *spiritual* Nature and Promises with the Covenant revealed to *Abraham*.

His Lordship will therefore be obliged, either to give up his Interpretation of these Words, or his particular System with regard to the *Sanctions* of the *Mosaic* Law. For what so unaccountable, as to deny the Law the *Sanction* of a future State, and yet to refer us to a Passage, as affording a good Proof of another Life, which contains the *Sanction* of the Law.

Thus his Lordship leaves no Difference in the *Patriarchal*, the *Legal*, and the *Christian* Dispensations; with respect to this grand Sanction, the Doctrine of a future State. For the Law must have had the very same promise of life and immortality with the Gospel, if the *Jews* understood the phrase of being the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, in the sense asserted by his Lordship.

Dr. *Rutherford* maintains, that the promise of life and immortality was attached to the *Abrahamic* Covenant; when God declared, that he would be the God of *Abraham*, and his Seed after him. But as this promise



promise was transferred and incorporated into the Law; he asserts the promise of Life and Immortality to the *legal* as well as to the *patriarchal* Covenant. Thus He fairly and honestly takes in the necessary consequence of his own exposition. This the learned Prelate declines. The learned Prelate had perhaps the better forecast: However the Dr. must be allowed to be *more consistent*. It would be ungenerous to deny him this praise; since he pays so very dear for his consistency, or has been driven by it to espouse an Hypothesis, which seems to be exploded, by all the learned of these Times, (a).

A reverend Gentleman (b) has produced this Declaration (*I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*) to prove that the Promise of eternal Life was attached to the *Abrahamic* Covenant; and he has also produced it to prove, that the Promise of Life and Immortality was revealed in the Book of *Deuteronomy*. However he affirms withal, that this promise made no Part of the Law. He therefore pretends, "that the covenant renewed  
" by *Moses* with the People, and described  
" in the xxixth and xxxth Chapters of  
" *Deuteronomy*, was not the *Horeb* or Mount  
" *Sinai* Covenant; but the ancient *Abrahamic*  
" Covenant, *which was the same with the*  
" *Christian*." U 6 In

(a) I mean the Hypothesis, which asserts that future Rewards and Punishments were the *Sanction* of the Law. Argum. of D. L. p. 21. to 25. (b) Mr. Peters on Job.

In Virtue of *this distinction* he is consistent in assigning the *Abrahamic* Covenant the Sanction of a future State; and yet denying it to the Law. How my Lord Bishop proposes to be consistent too, I shall not pretend to say; it would ill become me to suppose, that he will have recourse to any distinction of this sort; or pretend that "the CHRISTIAN Covenant was revealed in the xxixth and xxxth Chapters of Deuteronomy (c)." To proceed: His Lordship has urged some Arguments to prove that the Law was not intended to restore Mankind to

(c) This learned Writer has favoured us with Answers to three of the capital Objections to the common System. As his solutions seem to be very ingenious, subtle, and refined; I will here lay them before the Reader.

If He be asked, why God's engaging to be the God of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, did not imply the Promise of Life and Immortality in the Law, as well as in the *Abrahamic* Covenant: He has, we see, his *Distinction* ready; that this Engagement, as it stands in the xxixth of *Deuteronomy*, is attached to the *Abrahamic* or *Christian* Covenant; and not to the Law.

If He be asked, how *David* and *Hezekiah* could speak of *Themselves*, and the *righteous Jew*, as going after Death into a Place of Silence and Forgetfulness; consistently with the Supposition that they believed a State of future Rewards and Happiness was appointed for them: Here he again *distinguishes*, and says; these holy Men speak only of the PAGANS, "who were to be left for ever in the State of Death; so as never more to rise for happiness (a)." And thus we are to suppose, that *David* speaks only of the PAGANS; when he says, "What profit is there in MY Blood; when I go down to the Pit? Shall the Dust praise thee? Shall it declare thy Truth (b)?"

(a) Dissertation on Job, p. 225.

(b) Psalm xxx. 9.

the lost Inheritance of Life and Immortality (a). Now this is urging just so many Arguments, to prove that the Promise of being the God of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, was not to be originally understood of a *future Life*, since the Law is evidently founded on that Promise.

His Lordship gives the *Jews* great Advantages; by supposing, that God promises a Restoration to our lost Inheritance of Life and Immortality, in his Engagement to be the God of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*. For if the *Law* was given in order to execute this Promise, or to reinstate Men in the Inheritance of eternal Life; what farther had the *Jews* to look for; or what Occasion could there be for the new Institution of the Gospel? Whatever there might be, of a *Jewish Messiah*, to develope that Doctrine more explicitly?

“ If  
If He be asked, why the Promises and Threatnings of the Law were only *Temporal*? He has a *Distinction* still at hand. It was because they related to the People *in general*, and did not extend to *Particulars* and *Individuals*. P. 258. But though we may think ever so well of the Dexterity of our *Distinguisber*; what must we think of the System, that stands in need of such Artists!

(a) P. 141, 142, 143, &c.



“ If the *Law* (says his Lordship) was  
 “ given in Execution of the *Promise*, made  
 “ to all Nations; then have the Nations  
 “ nothing further to expect; God has ful-  
 “ filled his Word: The *Jews* are right, in  
 “ adhering to their *Law*; and we in the  
 “ wrong, in rejecting it (a).” His Lord-  
 ship will own, that the *Promise*, made to  
 all Nations, was included in the Declara-  
 tion that God would be the God of *Abra-  
 ham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*; which is supposed  
 to be the whole Substance and Epitome of  
 the *Abrahamic* or *Christian* Covenant. The  
*Law* therefore being given in Execution of  
 this *Promise*, or to make good this Decla-  
 tion, there remains nothing farther to ex-  
 pect; God has fulfilled his Word: The  
*Jews* are right in adhering to the *Law*, and  
 we in the wrong for rejecting it.

His Lordship observes well, that the  
*Jews* would be glad to find in their own  
*Law*, “ whatever appears to them to be  
 “ excellent in the Gospel; that they may  
 “ shew the little Need there was for the  
 “ Gospel Revelation (b).” But then has not  
 his Lordship himself enabled them to prove  
 that the *Law* contains what is most excellent

(a) P. 141.

(b) P. 228.

in the *Gospel*; when he assures them, that the Sanction and Foundation of the *Law*, namely, God's Promise to be the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, *affords a good Proof of a future Life?*

He has in Truth enabled them to prove, that the *Legal Covenant* was the very same with the *Christian*: For he holds, that the *Abrabamic Covenant* was the very same with the *Christian*; and we have shewn, that the *Legal* was, as to Essentials, the very same with the *Abrabamic Covenant*; as it was established on the very SAME PROMISE.

His Lordship, in vain upbraids the *Jews* for their Perverseness, in adhering to their *Law*; while his argument is so evidently calculated to confirm them in their prejudices. For the *Law*, they will tell him, on his own Principles, contains what is *most excellent in the Gospel*.

But to proceed. If this Passage (*I am the God of Abraham, &c.*) extends to another life; it will follow, that the doctrine of future rewards and punishments was as much the Sanction of the *Law*, as of the *Gospel*. And if the Sanction, it should, of

necessity, have been as clearly and explicitly revealed by Moses, as by Jesus. For it would greatly discredit any Legation from Heaven, to suppose a Law given to men, in which the Sanction was involved in doubts and obscurities. There being no Truth more evident than this, that the Sanction of a Law should be as precise and clear, as the Law itself. To suppose otherwise, as in the case before us, is making the divine Law of Moses more imperfect, insufficient, and even unjust, than any human Laws whatsoever.

It would then, we see, make nothing for the honour of the Law; to assign it any Revelation of this doctrine, short of one full and clear. And to give it such a one, would flatly contradict the Scriptures of the New Testament; and deprive Jesus Christ of the glory of *bringing Life and Immortality to Light*, even in the low sense in which his Lordship chuses to understand the phrase.

According to his exposition, Moses told the Jews; that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, *notwithstanding the Dissolution of their Bodies*, were then enjoying the reward of their labours; or the future happiness, which  
 God



God promised when he engaged to be their God. So that good men were taught to expect, that the reward of their labours, or the future happiness appointed for them, was to be enjoy'd in a state of separate existence. But to what purpose was this instruction, if (as his Lordship assures us in this very Sermon) (a) the People were not able to comprehend his meaning, or were not able to conceive that the soul, during its state of separation from the body, could be capable of either happiness or misery (b)

If the notion of rewards and punishments in this separate and distinct state, was absolutely unintelligible; or the very possibility of the thing was above the comprehension

(a) P. 204. 205.

(b) Since his Lordship affirms, that the common People are not capable of understanding, that they can either be punished or rewarded in a State of separate Existence; I would beg leave to ask, in what manner *christian* Preachers are to speak of the state between death and the resurrection. It will be to no purpose to talk of rewards and punishments to be dispensed during this period, if the language be utterly unintelligible.

prehension of his People; the mention of it could have made no impression, and consequently would have had no effect. Moses therefore must have been more grossly ignorant and stupid, than the dullest of his People; when he made it the *Sanction* of his Religion.

In a word, we magnify the Law above the Gospel; if we allow it to afford a good *proof of a future life*, as his Lordship here supposes. For in this case, it would have the sanction both of the *life which now is, and of that which is to come*; while the Gospel would have only the last.

His Lordship maintains, that this Doctrine was delivered under the cover of types and figures, in the Law. On the one hand, a *good proof* would have excluded the use of types and figures: And, on the other, the propriety of types and figures, will not permit us to expect any plain or clear, that is, *good proof* of this Doctrine, at that time.

The point in dispute is, whether the Law afforded *such* a proof of a future life, as would be sufficiently obvious and intelligible to the ancient

ancient Jews. Now these words (*I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*) seem not to have convey'd any such notice; seeing our Saviour's interpretation "has all the marks of a new argument, unknown to the Pharisees; and indeed both the dignity of our Lord's character, and the impression he would make on his Opposers, seemed to require it. Accordingly we find them struck dumb; and the Multitude that heard this, astonished at his doctrine. But would either have been so affected with an old argument, long hacknied in the Schools or Synagogues of the Pharisees (a)?" Now if the more learned Pharisees who lived just before, or in the age of the Gospel, zealous in the propagation of the doctrine of a future state, and eager and inquisitive to find it in the Law; had not, with all their refinements, joined to their acuteness, been able to make this text say any thing for their purpose; we may safely conclude, the doctrine was not so plainly revealed here; as to have been obvious and visible to the

X 3

gross

(a) D. L. V. 2. P. 573.



gross body of the Jews in the Time of Moses (a).

It was hardly possible for the ancient Jews to understand this phrase in a *spiritual* sense. They were told, in the *Book of Genesis*, that God had engaged to be the God of Abraham and his seed. They were told, in the Law, that God brought them out of Egypt, and put them in possession of the land of Canaan, in order to be *their* God; or to discharge the promise of being the God of Abraham and his seed. The manner, in which he promised to be their God, is described very fully. "I will set my Tabernacle amongst you. ——— And I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my People. (b)"

Again, one is entirely at a loss to understand, why his Lordship should suppose, that God would reveal the doctrine of a *future*

(a) Quis credat Christum Dominum argumento isto, Ego sum Deus Abrahami, Isaaci, et Jacobi, pro resurrectione mortuorum pugnaturum fuisse contra sadduceos, si clare atque in terminis promissio vite eterne, aut Resurrectionis mortuorum in V. Testamento facta fuisset? Nemo Christianus jam tali argumento uteretur, cum clara ad manum habeat loca. Episcopus Vol. 2. 304 p.

(b) Leviticus, xxvi. 11, 12.

*future state* in the *old testament*, and reserve that of the *resurrection* for the *New*. If the *Jews* were ripe for the knowledge and reception of the first, they could not be indisposed and unprepared for the knowledge and reception of the last.

My Lord Bishop has often observed, that the several ancient revelations corresponded to the particular state and necessity of the times, in which they were given. But can he point out any particular age, in which the doctrine of the resurrection was not as necessary to be known, as that of a future state? If he could do this, he must needs be wrong, on the other hand, in supposing that the doctrine of a future state could not be established without the knowledge of the resurrection.

Dr. Stebbing is so far from holding that the Resurrection was reserved to be revealed by Jesus; that he contends "it was the *ancient, traditional, interpretation* of the *Abrahamic covenant* (a)." It is remarkable, the Doctor affirms the resurrection had been long known; and yet was not necessary to the ends and purposes of religion.

(a) Examination, p. 114.

**Religion (a.)** On the contrary, the learned Prelate affirms, that it was absolutely necessary for these ends and purposes, and yet was not known before the age of the Gospel.

After all, it is not easy to ascertain what his Lordship means by the *good proof* of a future life, which he discovers in the Law. One would naturally suppose him to mean, *such a Proof* as was well calculated to convince men of the truth and certainty of a future life; especially as he holds, that the clearest conviction of this truth and certainty was necessary to support the interests of Religion. He seems therefore to be taking with one hand, and giving with the other: He ascribes to the Law a *good proof of a future life*; and, then in the following pages contends, that it left this doctrine under *doubts* and *uncertainties*; i. e. left men *doubtful* and *uncertain*, whether there was a future state or no. How could that be a *good proof*, which left men uncertain of the Reality of the thing to be proved? Of *what*, or to *whom* could it be a *good proof*?

(a) Boyle's Lectures, P. 33, l. 4, 5.

His



His Lordship affirms in his Sermon, that the Law afforded a *good proof* of a future life, without revealing the doctrine of the resurrection. And yet he affirms in the same Sermon, that no satisfactory proof of a future state could be given, without revealing this doctrine. Nay, he even contends, that the hopes of futurity would have been *very absurd*, without the knowledge of the resurrection. It is not easy to conceive, how this doctrine could be supported by a *good proof*, and yet be *very absurd* at the same time. However, if the *absurdity* was so glaring and apparent, men's doubts and uncertainties with regard to a futurity would naturally preponderate; and the *good proof* have just the same effect as no proof at all.

In the beginning of the Sermon he observes, that the Law afforded a *good proof* of a future life; and yet towards the conclusion he assures us, that *Religion at this time had hardly one sound foot to stand on*; and "that *Faith* and "*Reason* were at too great a distance to be "united." Now the proof must have been good for very little, if it left Religion in so lame and helpless a state; or did not afford such evidence,

evidence, as to make the belief of a future life *consistent with Reason.*

On the whole then we find, that the Advocates of the common system, since the publication of the *D. L.*, have been necessitated to innovate a little, to adopt new maxims, to invent new refinements, and (not to quarrel with them for a word) to introduce their *improvements* for the support of the common system.

We are *now* told, 1st. That the several Revelations, both before, and under the Law, had left the doctrine of a future state involved in doubts and uncertainties; whereas the assertors of this System had maintained, *till now*, that the Faithful in every age had plain and clear evidence of the certainty and reality of another life. We are *now* told, 2dly. That the principle of the resurrection was reserved to be revealed by Jesus Christ; whereas the assertors of this System had maintained, *till now*, that it was revealed both before and under the Law.

When the *D. L.* was first publish'd, it was objected, that not only the doctrine of a future life, but even that of the resurrection, had been brought to light in the ages preceding the Gospel. But it is now said; the first was but faintly and obscurely discover'd, and the  
 se-

second not discover'd at all, before the coming of our Saviour.

Who then is it that has thrown the *common System* INTO CONEUSION? He, who thought it not worth mending; or They, who have innovated, altered, and refined, in the manner here mentioned, in order to hide its dishonours, and to secure it against the attacks of its adversaries. How far, giving to the *Law*, the doctrine of a future state without knowledge of the resurrection (especially if the *first* would have been not only *intenable*, but even *unintelligible*, without the *last*) may tend to soften its disgraces, and to re-establish its credit, must be submitted to the Judgment of the public (a).

I shall

(a) As we are setting forth the several inconsistencies which deform the System of the learned Prelate, it may be proper to remark, that his Lordship sometimes assigns the knowledge of the *resurrection*, as well as of a *future state*, to the ancient Jews; long before the publication of the Gospel.

“Women received their dead raised to life again; and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better *Resurrection*.” (Hebrews xi. 35.) Upon this his Lordship observes, “That the resurrection was a state they had never seen, it was what they could only hope for; but the *promise of God* was to them more than the evidence of sight.” (Sermons, V. I. p. 376.)

This



I shall conclude all with a disension of this Question; "Whether the extraordinary

pro-

This passage no way interferes with the argument of the *D. L.*; because it speaks of the belief of the Jews in the time of the *Maccabees*, which is posterior to the time in question. However it plainly interferes with his Lordship's *fiath* Sermon; if it gives the Jews the knowledge of the resurrection, in virtue of a *divine promise*, or *revelation*, long before the publication of the Gospel.

If the doctrine of a future <sup>life</sup> was thus perfectly cleared up and enlightened in all its parts, during this period; the word *παριζω*, even in the low sense which his Lordship contends for, would not have been applicable to it at this time.

All the use then he makes of this *eleventh* chapter to the *Hebrews*, is only to confute his own hypothesis; which limits the doctrine of the resurrection to the *new Testament*.

If any one should imagine; that the *several* Acts of Faith, magnified and extolled in this chapter, mean Faith in *Jesus Christ*, considered as the Author of eternal life; I shall refer him to the *D. L.* (a) for a full confutation of this despicable and idle Whim.

The passages, quoted in the first part of these papers (b), may shew; that such an interpretation is inconsistent with other parts of that epistle. The Author never would say, the promise of life and immortality was revealed so long before, and under the Law; after he had declared that it *was* *first* to be *spoken* by *Jesus Christ*. It would have been very extraordinary

in

(a) V. II. p. 578, &c.

(b) P. 3, 48, 9, &c.

providence, as recorded in the old testament to be administer'd by a long series of Miracles, can be supported against the objections of Unbelievers, on the principles of the common System."

The Law and the Gospel, when first given, were both establish'd by MIRACLES. But by

in him to assure us, that the Jews were all their Lifetime subject to Bondage through Fear of Death —

That the Way to Heaven was not made manifest under the Law — That the better Hope of eternal Life

was introduced AFTERWARDS: And then to add, that the Way to Heaven had been made manifest, and this better Hope revealed, before and under the Law; and that the Jews had the same Faith in Jesus, which Christians now have; whereby they cry *Abba, Father*, and are received into the Adoption of Sons. Are we to charge an inspired Author with such glaring and obvious Contradictions, as would disgrace a Writer of modern Fragments and Essays?

I shall readily allow, that the doctrine of a future State was communicated to Abraham, and to some others, mentioned in this chapter. But unless it had been imparted to them, as a singular favour; and they were restrained from making it popular and common; How could the Author of the epistle have said, that it BEGUN FIRST to be spoken by Jesus Christ?

If it were revealed under the Law, it must have been revealed under this limitation; otherwise how could the Author of the epistle say, that the way to Heaven was not made manifest under the Law, or that the better Hope (of eternal life) was brought in AFTERWARDS?

the histories of these Religions we find, that the two Dispensations of Providence were very different. The Law, after it had been originally establish'd by Miracles, continued for many ages to be supported by them; or was administer'd and conducted by a constant scene of divine and extraordinary interpositions. We find, that God was almost always interfering, and manifesting himself in a continued series of signs and wonders; in order to preserve and maintain the Law; or to encourage and promote the Observance of it; after it had been introduced, and sufficiently establish'd by the evidence of Miracles. On the other hand, the Gospel, tho' originally establish'd by the same evidence, was, in succeeding times, left to subsist by common and ordinary means; without such a Miraculous and supernatural interposition, as supported the Law for many ages, after it was first erected.

Here then it will be obvious to ask; How a constant scene of miracles, or a continued series of divine interpositions, became necessary to support Religion, and to attach men to their duty, under the Law; and unnecessary to this purpose, under the Gospel. Now, as Miracles are never wrought for



for ostentation, we may be sure they would not have been wrought at all, if the Jewish Religion had been able to subsist, like the Christian, by common and ordinary Means. If it stood in need of such great *external* helps, it must have laboured under some very great *internal* weakness. It is happy for us, that such learned hands as my Lord Bishop of London, and Dr. Stephen, have attempted to point out this original and inherent imperfection and defect.

" You see now (says his Lordship) upon  
 " what Foot all the Prophecies in the Old  
 " Testament stand, which relate to the tem-  
 " poral affairs of the Jewish nation; you see  
 " likewise the reason, why this kind of pro-  
 " phesy has ceased in the Christian Church:  
 " The Gospel is not founded in temporal  
 " promises; so far from it, that we are cal-  
 " led upon to take up our Cross and follow  
 " Christ. The bringing in of these better  
 " hopes has vacated the promises of the Mosaic  
 " covenant; and 'tis expected of us, after so  
 " much light, that our Faith should be proof  
 " against the adversities of the world; with-  
 " out the help of a Prophet to foretel, or to  
 " reveal to us in every instance the Will of  
 " God."

Now

Now the bringing in of better hopes, which has vacated the promises of the Mosaic Covenant since Christ," plainly supposes, that a good proof of a future state in the Law, would have vacated the promises of the Mosaic Covenant, long before. So that surely it can never be worth our while to contend, that the Law did afford *such a proof*, if the consequence be the stripping and divesting it of the promises which relate to the present life. When his Lordship therefore so strenuously asserted this doctrine to the Law, it is pity but he had reflected, that the *spiritual* Promises can be only raised on the ruins of such as were *temporal*.

Unbelievers will readily agree with his Lordship, in ascribing this doctrine to the Law, if he will but persevere in what he here affirms, viz. that these better hopes would vacate the *temporal* promises of the Mosaic Covenant. For as their sole aim is to invalidate the evidence of Miracles, recorded in the Old Testament, it is indifferent to them, whether they do it by his Lordship's Medium, or by any other.

The learned Prelate observes, that the " Jewish Government, being a Theocracy, " leads us to expect a series of Miracles " in

in the administration, by the *immediate hand* of providence (a). That we might not suppose he speaks only of an extraordinary providence *over the State in general*, he informs us a little after, that these miracles were wrought for *particular purposes*, and in behalf of *particular people* (b).

"We read in the old Testament (says his Lordship) of some *Miracles* wrought in behalf of *particular people*, and for *particular purposes*.——These are to be considered as *acts of government*, and suitably to the character of God as *King of Israel*; for, where the Government itself was *divine*, no wonder to see the measures of the Government to be of the same kind. And this character of God being peculiar to the *Jews*, is the reason why such Miracles were frequent under the *Jewish Law*, and are very rarely to be met with under the Gospel." (c)

This may be consider'd as his DETERMINATION of the great point in dispute between Dr. Warburton and his adversaries; since his Lordship makes an extraordinary providence, descending to particulars and individuals, *the necessary consequence of a Theocracy*.

(a) Sermons, V. L p. 288. (b) 296. (c) p. 296, 7.



Now as he agrees with the Author of the *D. L.*, in asserting the Reality of this extraordinary providence; the Question will be, whether, to be consistent with himself, he ought not to have agreed with him too in denying the Jews the knowledge of a future state. And here he seems to have DETERMIN'D the point against himself; by affirming, "That the better hopes of a future life would have vacated the temporal promises of the Law."

When his Lordship therefore ascribes to the Law a good proof of a future life in one Sermon, and the administration of an extraordinary providence in another; he is attempting to join and bring together things, which he himself has declared to be incompatible.

*"Serpentes avibus geminantur, tigribus agni."*

Lord Bolingbroke affirms these two things, 1<sup>st</sup>. That the Law has not the doctrine of a future state. 2. That the Jewish history is utterly incredible, since it abounds with the relation of miracles, or divine and extraordinary interpositions; and is not conformable to Experience, and to the natural course of Things." (a)

Now in opposition to the first, the learned Prelate maintains; that the Law had the doc-

(a) V. 5. p. 344. 5. 8vo.

trine of a *future state*. In opposition to the second, he maintains; that the Miracles, or divine and extraordinary interpositions, were necessary to supply the absence and omission of a *future state*. Thus, on different occasions, he makes no scruple to assert against Infidels, both that the Law had, and that it had not the doctrine of a *future state*; that is, he finds himself obliged to assert and deny the very same proposition in the very same sense.

But can it be imagined, that the Followers of the noble Lord will permit him to suppose the absence and omission of a future state in the *Jewish Religion*, in order to establish the reality of an extraordinary providence against their Master: And then, again, permit him to suppose that the *Jewish Religion* had a future state, against their Master; in order to remove what he objects to the divinity of it for want of this doctrine?

The Law would have stood in no more need of miracles and supernatural interpositions, or any *foreign, extrinsic, and adventitious* helps, than the Gospel; if the Jewish Religion had been established on the same doctrine of a future state. For this Principle must have given the very same force and ef-

ficacy to each System, if it had belonged to them in common.

My Lord Bishop holds, that the Law was given to propagate and dispense the doctrines revealed in the patriarchal Religion; which he supposes to have been the same with the Christian. It must therefore have been essentially the same with the Gospel; since it was appointed to propagate and dispense the same doctrines. And if the *Jewish* and Christian Religions were composed of the same essential principles; a continued series of miracles and divine interpositions had no more connexion with the one than the other.

According to his Lordship, the doctrine of life and immortality was revealed to the Patriarchs; and afterwards publicly taught and cultivated under the Law, as well as the Gospel. The consequence of this is; that revealed Religion, *as to its Essentials*, has been one and the same, in the several ages of the world. The Question therefore will be, why Miracles were necessary to support it at one period, and not at another?

As his Lordship affirms, that the Law was given to propagate and dispense the doctrines of the patriarchal Religion (*a*); he must suppose it given to propagate and dispense the doctrine of life and immortality. It was ap-

(*a*) See Chapter IV.



pointed therefore to propagate and dispense a doctrine, which, on his own concessions, would have rendered this series of Miracles of no use.

It is indeed astonishing, that this truly learned and great Man should adopt such principles; as will oblige him to suppose, that the Law was given to propagate the doctrine of life and immortality; and to suppose likewise, that a succedaneum was necessary to supply the absence and omission of this very doctrine (a).

He observed, that the principle of a future state is able to support Religion at present, by its own natural influence and power; without the addition of Miracles, or any such foreign and adventitious helps. Hence he infers, that there could be no occasion for Mi-

(a) His Lordship observes, "That the true Religion instituted by God has been *one* and the *same* from the Fall of *Adam*, subsisting ever upon the same principles of Faith." (b)

If the principle of Faith in the Redeemer of the world, or the belief of a restoration to life and immortality, was sufficient to support Religion at all times; or if Religion has been enabled to *subsist* at all times, by virtue of this principle; how could Miracles have been necessary to preserve and maintain it in the age of the Law?

---

[b] Discourses on prophecy, p. 75.

acles, or divine interpositions, to support a Religion thus circumstanced. To make room therefore for these Miracles and divine interpositions in the *Jewish* Religion, he finds himself obliged to strip and divest it of the doctrine of a future state.

" I do not think, says Dr. *Stebbing*, that  
 " temporal Advantages, merely as such, are  
 " an improper foundation for Religion. For  
 " the *Jews* were under a covenant with  
 " God, established upon the foot of *tempo-*  
 " *ral promises*; and the obedience, which  
 " they paid in view of these promises, was  
 " undoubtedly a reasonable service, as it was  
 " Obedience paid upon motives proposed by  
 " the Legislator himself" (a).

He owns, that the *Jewish* RELIGION was establish'd on the sanction of temporal good and evil. He will own, that this good and evil could not be dispensed without *Miracles*. Thus *Miracles* were necessary, in order to execute and discharge the sanctions of the *Jewish* Religion (b).

The

[a] *Boyle's Lectures*, p. 202. p. 203.

(b) When the *D. L.* was first published, Dr. *Sykes* made no scruple to affirm, that the temporal Rewards and Punishments of the Law did not extend to particulars and individuals. On this a large train of testimonies was

The Question therefore is, how the temporal rewards and punishments became ne-

Y 4

cessary

collected, to evince the contrary (a). And they seem not to have been ill calculated for this purpose; as they have drove and forced him into the Opinion he at first opposed (b). This I mention to his honour; and as a proof of that *openness to conviction*, that *ingenuity* and *Candour*, which he professed in the beginning of the Controversy.

The Dispute between him and Dr. Warburton, with respect to the extraordinary Providence, is now reduced to a narrow Compass. They both allow, that the temporal Rewards and Punishments of the Law extend to Particulars and Individuals. The only Question therefore, is, whether they were executed or no; i. e. whether the Law was given by God. For if it was given by him, there can be no question but its Promises and Threatnings would be discharged and executed.

He confesses, that the temporal Sanctions were exactly executed at first; and not intirely dropt and laid aside, but less constantly and frequently administer'd afterwards. "Whilst the Children of Israel (says he) were in the Wilderness, the Law was fixed, and rigidly executed: But afterwards there seems to have been a great Relaxation under their Judges and their Kings (c)."

Without

---

(a) See Argument of the D. L. P. 57.—74.

(b) Comment on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Pag. 20, 21, 92, 120.

(c) Comment on the Hebrews, P. 21.



cessary for this purpose? The learned Doctor with great candour and ingenuity acknowledges that they were necessary, because the Doctrine

Without declaring any sentiment of my own, I will here propose a Query, and ask, how this great relaxation, in the time of the Judges, could be consistent with the original tenour and constitution of the Law?

"Curled is every one that continueth not in all things, which are written in the Book of the Law to do them."

"Ye shall keep my Statutes and my Judgments, which if a Man do, he shall live in them (d)."

Unbelievers will say, the Law promised a temporal reward, and threatned a temporal punishment, to every observer and transgressor of it. In this the learned Doctor intirely agrees with them; when he declares,

"The Law had promised temporal blessings to its observers, and had denounced as severe curses on such as disobey'd it (e)."

Now as he agrees with them in this common Principle, they will naturally ask, why these blessings and curses were not constantly and regularly dispensed, in the same measure and extent in which they were promised and threatned? And what answer will the Doctor make to this Question, when it is limited and confined to the time of the Judges?

Dr. Law and Dr. Fortin contend, that the Mosaic Covenant had no Sanction, but what was temporal. Now since the written Word assures us, that this Sanction was addressed to every observer and infringer of the Law,

---

(d) Leviticus xviii. 5.

(e) Comment on the Hebrews, P. 29.

Doctrine of a future State was not clearly revealed at this time (a).

Thus Miracles were necessary to execute the temporal promises and threatnings of the Law. And these temporal Promises and Law; the Deist will ask these learned Writers, whence it comes; that these temporal rewards and punishments were not administer'd and dispensed to every Jew without exception, in proportion to his observance or neglect of the Law?

It would be very obliging in the learned Doctors to favour us with the Solution of a difficulty, in which the honour of Revelation is so nearly concerned. I mention it in this place, because the fate of some of their *principal* and *leading* arguments will be entirely determined by it.

(a) "The end, both of the Law and the Gospel, was the same; *to wit*, the leading men to the worship of the true God. As a motive to this, the one proposes a TEMPORAL, the other an eternal Inheritance. Now, from this *Diversity of the motive* under each Dispensation, this difference indeed must necessarily arise; that there is no FARTHER need of the Promise of an EARTHLY CANAAN, the heavenly being so fully and clearly revealed." Essay on Civil Government, P. 46.

It is of no importance to the present argument, whether the doctrine of a future state was not revealed at all, or was not so clearly and fully revealed, as to be able to support Religion, without the promise of a temporal Inheritance, or the possession of an earthly Canaan.

See the Argument of the D. L. P. 91, 92.

threat-

threatnings were necessary, because the doctrine of a future state was not fully and clearly revealed.

We have observed, that the Miracles, recorded in the Jewish history, are of two sorts. Some were wrought to prove the divine authority and original of the Law. Others were wrought long after its full establishment, as it was for many ages under a miraculous administration, or conducted by a continued series of divine and extraordinary interpositions. The present Question relates only to this last order of Miracles.

The more rational Advocates for Revelation allow, that no human testimony will be sufficient to prove the reality of Miracles, unless they be properly circumstanced; i. e. unless there appear some competent reason for working them, or some occasion worthy a divine interposition. Accordingly they observe, that giving Credentials to a Person, sent to reveal a new scheme or system of Religion, is such an occasion, and that we may reasonably look for and expect Miracles in these circumstances (a).

It is evident, that this argument does not extend to the Miracles in question; as

(a) *Adams against Hume*, 2d Edit. p. 26, 27.

they



they were not intended to be subservient to the introduction and establishment of a new Religion, but were wrought long <sup>after</sup> before it had been introduced and established in the most perfect and complete manner.

Dr. Leland, indeed, maintains, that the primary and immediate intent of these Miracles was *to confirm* the divine authority of the Law (a). The supposition seems unreasonable; as the Miracles originally wrought to evince its divinity, were sufficient for this purpose; and consequently, the Jewish Religion, in succeeding ages, had no more occasion for the evidence of additional and new Miracles, than the Christian. If Unbelievers ask, why Miracles are not worked now to confirm the Gospel: Dr. Leland replies, that those originally wrought with this view supersede the use of others at present. And does not this reasoning equally prove; that the Miracles originally wrought to evince the divinity of the Law, would supersede the use of those in question?

It will be readily allowed, that the divine origin of the Law, may be proved from

(a) View of Deistical Writers, Vol. II. P. 391.

these

these extraordinary interpositions. But if we would know their *primary* and *immediate* intent, we must consider the occasion on which they were wrought. And if we consult the history of the *Jews*, we shall find, that they were made use of to dispense rewards and punishments, in proportion to their neglect of, and obedience to, the Law. Now as they were appointed to be the instruments of these rewards and punishments, their *primary* and *immediate* design must have been to maintain the Law in reverence and observation, and to fix the Israelites in their adherence to it (a).

The  
(a) The common wants of Nature, says an able "Writer," are provided for by the "common course of Nature. *Extraordinary occasions* only can call for "*extraordinary interpositions*," Mr. *Adam's Essay on Miracles*. Pag. 26. Ed. 2.

He supposes, that the establishment of a new Religion, or the giving character and authority to a special Messenger of God, was one of these *extraordinary occasions*. On this principle, he may defend the Miracles, which were *originally* wrought to confirm the truth and divine authority of the *Jewish* Religion. But Mr. *Hume*, with whom he is here arguing, not only denies the reality of *these* Miracles; but also of the *succeeding* ones, which were performed to support the observance of the Law, or to attach the *Jews* to the

The Doctor observes, that these Miracles were the necessary consequence of a Theocracy. And did not a Theocracy require God to interpose, in order to reward and punish the observers and transgressors of the Law? These Miracles therefore were properly *Acts of Government*, in execution and discharge of the denounced punishments and rewards annexed to the Law.

In short, they were founded on the sanction of temporal rewards and punishments, which God had engaged to administer and dispense by his own hand. Miracles, or divine interpositions, were requisite for this purpose. They were therefore interwoven into

the worship and service of the one true God. It is much to be lamented, that the learned Writer, who has so well defended the former, did not proceed to the consideration of these latter Miracles. "If common experience, says he, does not attest or acknowledge such interpositions, the answer is given ——— common occasions do not call for them. The common wants of Nature are provided for by the common course of Nature. Extraordinary occasions only can call for extraordinary interpositions." P. 26.

The learned Person will allow; that the common interests of Religion are sufficiently provided for in the common course of Nature, by the doctrine of a future state. I would ask then, what those extraordinary occasions were, which so often called for extraordinary interpositions after the establishment of the Law.



into the very frame and structure of the Jewish Religion, and made a necessary and essential part of it.

To justify the use and propriety of these particular Miracles, we must prove that the dispensation of temporal rewards and punishments was necessary to support and enforce the Jewish Religion, which would have been unable to subsist without them. Now as Dr. Leland has not attempted to do this, he has done what disputants on all sides are but too apt to do; he has left Lord Bolingbroke, and his Followers, in full possession of the argument.

He maintains, that the Jewish and the Christian Religions were *substantially* and *essentially* the same; or composed of the same doctrines and principles. The Question then is; why the same essential principles and doctrines, which are able to sustain it *now*, without any foreign, extrinsic, and adventitious helps; were not able to sustain it without Miracles, and divine interpositions, in the *age of the Law*?

It may be said, these interpositions were requisite, because God had engaged to dispense temporal rewards and punishments; and consequently had incorporated and interwoven Miracles into the very frame and

con-

constitution of the Jewish Religion. But the Question is, how this Religion came to be framed and constituted in so very singular and extraordinary a manner. For we may be certain, that Miracles would no more have been interwoven into the frame and constitution of the Jewish Religion than the Christian, if the one had been as able to subsist without them, as the other.

It may be said, the Theocracy naturally prepares us to expect a series of Miracles; as the necessary consequence of this particular mode of Government. But we shall still be asked, how God came to assume the office of civil Governor, which required the dispensation of temporal rewards and punishments; or a continued series of Miracles? For it is utterly incredible that he should have enter'd into any engagements of this sort, or have erected a Theocracy; unless the Jewish Religion had been so circumstanced, as to have been unable to subsist without these miraculous interpositions.

This Theocracy could only be proper and expedient in the time of a preparatory or introductory Dispensation. And such a Dispensation could be of no use, after the Revelation of the promise of Redemption and

and a future state, which was the grand and capital article of the final and ultimate Religion. The writers therefore, who hold such a Revelation, are not at liberty to suppose a Theocracy; or to defend their hypothesis by arguments deduced from it. (a)

Upon the whole, it appears, that assigning the doctrine of a future state to the ancient *Jews*, would, upon his Lordship's own principles, have rendered the Theocracy, and the whole temporal Covenant, unnecessary. For he owns that it would have vacated and superseded the use of its *temporal promises*; and, after this, what end could the Covenant itself answer?

" If you enquire, (says my Lord Bishop)  
 " why God did so visibly interpose in the  
 " government of this people, always guiding  
 " and directing them in the conduct of tem-  
 " poral affairs, and matters of State, by the  
 " voice of his Prophets; when all other na-  
 " tions before and since, have been left, un-  
 " der the general rules of Providence, to  
 " their own conduct and discretion; the an-  
 " swer, I think, is this: No other nation e-  
 " ver had a divine Law, *given upon the esta-*

(a) See Chapter 4.



"*blissment of temporal blessings and punishments*; and therefore God had not so bound himself to any other nation, to account for their temporal prosperity and adversity, but to the *Jews*, with whom he had established a Law and a Covenant upon *temporal promises*, he stood obliged to make good his word, and to justify himself to them in the administration of *temporal affairs*."

"(a) *Discourses on Prophecy*, p. 132, 133.

Here his Lordship is giving an account of the history of these divine interpositions, and explaining the reason of the extraordinary dispensations under the Law. These, he tells us, were necessary in consequence of the temporal Covenant. But how can he have recourse to *this Covenant*, in order to solve any scripture difficulties; as its very existence and reality are destroyed by his Hypothesis? For no more than three pages before (b) he affirms, that the spiritual hopes of the Gospel were brought in and established under the Law; and but three pages after (c) he asserts, that the bringing in of these hopes, would vacate and supersede the pro-

"(a) *Discourses on Prophecy*, p. 132, 133.

"(b) 129.

"(c) 136, 7.

misses of the temporal Covenant, and consequently the Covenant itself.

According to his Lordship, there must have been something strangely unaccountable in the oeconomy of providence during this period. For he holds, that God established a Law and a Covenant upon temporal promises; and yet he holds, that Moses and the Prophets were, at the same time, directed to preach up such doctrines; as would render these temporal promises superfluous and unnecessary. (u)

It (a) Dr. Law says, "the Jewish covenant consisted of temporal things; — and therefore God was often obliged to interpose, in order to make good the performance of it." (*Considerations* p. 93).

Thus he supposes, "that God was often obliged to interpose," or that frequent miracles were necessary, to make good the temporal promises of the Jewish Religion. It will therefore be incumbent on him to point out the particular imperfection and defect in this Religion, which made such promises necessary; or else to shew, why temporal rewards were requisite to support the Religion of Moses; and yet not requisite to support the Religion of Jesus. Till he does this, he will be unable to defend the miracles in question against the objections of Unbelievers.

He has observed, "that the Law was a sort of servile confinement, and tutelary Regimen; conducting them, by present temporal rewards and earthly prospects;

It may be said, that my Lord Bishop and Dr. Stebbing will object, that these Miracles, or

“affording only a *dark, distant* intimation of better things; and introducing these in figurative representations, by Sacrifices, *Types*, and *Emblems*; till they, as well as the rest of the world, were got out of their *minority*, able to walk by a more perfect rule; and fit to enter on, and make a proper use of, their *Inheritance*.” (p. 98).

“Affording only a *dark, distant*, intimation of better things.”—He must say therefore, that extraordinary interpositions were necessary to help out these *dark* and *distant* intimations of a future state. Now it seems to be of very little importance to the argument of the *D. L.*, whether they were necessary to supply the *absence* and *omission*, or to help out the defect of those *dark* and *distant* intimations, of this doctrine.

But I shall here beg leave to examine the Hypothesis of this learned writer, without entering on, or undertaking the defence of, *the argument* abovementioned. He holds, that extraordinary interpositions were necessary to help out these *dark* and *distant* intimations. However he will own that they did not extend to every particular and individual case without exception. Upon what then, I would ask, was a good man to depend in one of these excepted cases; where he did not find his reward in this life? If the *dark* and *distant* intimations of a future state were sufficient to encourage and excite his obedience in *these* circumstances, they must have been sufficient to encourage and excite it in *all* circumstances; that is, they must have been a proper and adequate support of Religion, without the miracles or supernatural interpositions above-



divine interpositions, were not sufficient to preserve religion; without the doctrine of a fu-

mentioned. Consequently, these Miracles were *unnecessary*.

On the other hand, if these dark and distant intimations were not sufficient to encourage and excite obedience, in the circumstances here supposed; I ask, why plain and clear ones were not given in their room?

In vain will the learned writer attempt to prove, that the principle of a future state was necessary to help out the defects of this extraordinary providence. For if it became a motive of action, in cases to which this providence did not extend; it must have been equally so, in other circumstances; and consequently must have rendered the extraordinary interpositions unnecessary. If it did not become a motive of action, in these cases, it would not have helped out the defect we speak of.

If the extraordinary Providence was not sufficient to support the Law, the doctrine of future rewards and punishments must have been necessary for this purpose; and consequently ought to have been taught and inculcated as an *additional* SANCTION of the *Mosaic* Institutes. This very candid and learned Writer will pardon me, if I take the liberty to point out the difficulties, with which he will encumber and clog his system; if he maintains, that the belief of a future state was necessary to help out the extraordinary providence, and to support the Religion of the ancient *Jews*.

On this supposition, a future state must have been intended for the *sanction* of the Jewish Religion; and consequently ought to have been revealed in it with the

utmost

a future state. To this I reply; that this objection must needs be supported by something

utmost *perspicuity* and *clearness*. It would therefore have been a *disgrace* to the Law, to offer *dark* and *distant* intimations of a future life, under the cover of *types* and *emblems*.

If he will say, that this doctrine was intended for the *sanction* of the Religion of the ancient Jews; he must either prove against the Deists, that it was *plainly* and *explicitly* revealed to them; or give-up the truth and divinity of their religion. And as he asserts the *sleep of the soul*, during the interval between death and the resurrection; he can have no pretence to say, the doctrine of a future state was revealed; till the *resurrection* was discovered and brought to light. He must therefore either give-up the divine authority of the books of *Moses*; or prove that the *resurrection* is *plainly* and *explicitly* revealed in them.

The learned Doctor is the last man who should assert, that a future state was essential to the support of the patriarchal and jewish Religions; as his notion concerning the *sleep of the (a) soul*, will disable him from proving

---

(a) I have not called this an *old exploded Hypothesis*, (b), with a design to intimate, that any considerations of *this sort* would be sufficient to discredit and overthrow it. It's truth or falshood, as a scripture doctrine, must be determined by the authority of Scripture; and how far it may be invalidated or established by this testimony,

Z 3

(b) P. 60.

thing very curious and extraordinary in the art of reasoning; if while they maintain that these interpositions were *necessary* to supply

proving, that it was sufficiently revealed in either of these systems. For who would pretend to discover the doctrine of the *resurrection*, in any of the books of *Moses*? It will be necessary for him to shew how he can suppose, consistently with the following passages, that the principle of a future state has been always necessary to support religion.

“ Notwithstanding there might always be some extraordinary persons, who had a more enlarged prospect of things, and entertained more worthy sentiments of the divine Providences, such as *Enoch, Abraham, Noah*, and the like; yet these were far superior to the times in which they lived; and we have reason to think, that the *generality* both in this and some *later ages*, extended their views no farther than the *present life*, and its conveniencies (a).”

If Religion was able to subsist among the *generality* of the faithful in the patriarchal times, without the consideration

---

is a point, which I shall willingly leave to the examination of others. I have quoted the learned Doctor (p. 262.) as maintaining that the ancient Pagans had three hundred *supreme* Gods. And this I suppose him to advance with a design to shew, that *the one God* was publicly worshipped by them. But as this is not *expressly* asserted by him, I desire that what is there said may be applied to his assertion only; and not to the *view* and *intention* with which he made it.

(a) Considerations, p. 74.



supply the absence and omission of a future state in the religious system of the ancient Jews; they will yet contend, that the knowledge

of a future state; how will the learned writer prove, that this doctrine was necessary to support it among the generality of the ancient Jews?

Agreeably to the tenour of the passage just recited, he contends with *Le Clerc*, that neither *Job* nor his friends had the knowledge of another life; and yet he supposes, that they were perfectly well acquainted with the "Unity, omnipotence, and spirituality of God; the Justice of his Providence, and other Fundamentals of Religion (b)." Now the knowledge of a future state could not be essential to Religion; if the belief of all these articles might be established without it.

If therefore the learned writer ever argues on the contrary supposition, his reasoning must be inconsistent with his own concessions.

Thus the learned Doctor will involve himself in great difficulties; if he should make the knowledge of a future state necessary to supply the defects of the extraordinary providence, which was administered under the Law.

For, 1<sup>st</sup>, he will be obliged to prove, that the Resurrection was as plainly revealed by Moses, as by Jesus; not only without any warrant from the old testament, but also in direct opposition to the new.

2<sup>dly</sup>, He will be obliged to recede from his declarations; which suppose that Religion had subsisted a long time without the doctrine of a future state: or if he will adhere

ledge of a future state was necessary to supply the defects of this extraordinary providence. For then they must suppose, that this providence could not have been brought into the *Jewish* System, without excluding the doctrine of a future state; and must suppose also, that it could answer no end after it was brought in, without the additional aid and assistance of the excluded doctrine.

The Followers of the *first Philosophy* will say, that these Miracles make the history of the old Testament incredible. His Lordship tells them, that they were necessary to supply the want of *the better hopes*, which are revealed in the Gospel. These Gentlemen reply, that they were not sufficient for this purpose. And what will his Lordship say to this? What becomes of his vindication of these miracles, if they were not sufficient for this purpose? And if they were, what necessity was there for the doctrine of a future state (a)?

If  
adhere to these, he must shew, why an extraordinary providence was not as able to support Religion in the age of the Law, as it had been before.

(a) Dr. *Jortin* speaks much of the temporal Blessings promised by the Law, and likewise of the extraordinary

inter-

If my Lord Bishop and the Doctor should say, that God interposed for the purpose above

interpositions, which were the necessary consequence of them. " Though the Law promised temporal blessings to the good, yet the Jews (living in the time of our Saviour) knew by long experience, that those promises had not been fulfilled at all times, and to all persons. " Extraordinary interpositions in behalf of the righteous were grown less frequent; which was an intimation of a future state, and an argument by which it might be proved." *Discourses concerning the Christian Religion*. P. 12.

As he affirms, that the *Declension* and *Abatement* of these extraordinary interpositions, was an intimation of a future state; he must needs suppose, they had *once* been so regular and frequent, as to afford no intimation of this doctrine. I would ask therefore, how he will prove, that such a dispensation was needful; on the supposition that the Jews had the doctrine of a future state? Would God both reveal the doctrine, and interpose in an extraordinary manner to supply the want of it?

He owns that the extraordinary interpositions during the first ages of the Law, were so very frequent and numerous; as to supersede the use of the doctrine of a future state. He must own therefore, that the argument of the *D. L.* may, in its full extent, be applied to the *more* early ages of the Jewish History, and that the mission of Moses may be inferred by the medium, which *Dr. Warburton* has employed for this purpose.

As for the subsequent Relaxations and Abatements in the vigour of this extraordinary providence; I shall only



abovementioned; they must say, his interpositions were as frequent and numerous, as the

only concern myself so far with them, as to observe that Dr. Fortin's System will be greatly distressed and embroiled by them.

He contends, that the extraordinary interpositions were sufficient to maintain Religion in the *first* and *more early ages* of the Law; but that the knowledge of a future state became necessary, after these declined and relaxed, or grew less numerous and frequent. If so, this Knowledge became necessary, as an additional Sanction of the Law. The Followers therefore of the *First philosophy* will ask, why it was only INTIMATED; instead of being *plainly* and *expressly* revealed? for that it greatly discredits any revealed System, to suppose its sanctions were only *intimated*; or left to be collected by *Deduction* and *Inference*.

“The express promises (says he) made in the Law to the righteous were of temporal good things; and these promises began to be less and less fulfilled, to the disappointment of many pious persons; who *scarcely knew* how to reconcile these ways of providence with the “holy Scriptures” (a). If they *scarcely knew* how to account for these ways of providence; they would be much more embarrassed to deduce a future state from the promises of temporal good things. And why, say the Followers of Lord Bolingbroke, were they left under all this

As for the *Religious* and *Political* *System* of the *First philosophy*...

...the *First philosophy* is *not* to be *regarded* as *the* *only* *system*...

(a) Discourses on the Christian Religion. (P. 181.)

the interests of Religion required. They therefore preclude and debar themselves the liberty

this perplexity and embarrass, if the doctrine was necessary to be known, or Religion was unable to subsist without it?

As the learned Doctor holds this last position, he lays himself under a necessity of proving that this notion was delivered to the ancient Jews in a full, clear, and satisfactory manner; as the SANCTION of a revealed System ought to be. And how will he set about doing this, while he holds that the notion of a future state, was *secreted* under the cover and veil of Types; and contends also, that prophecies, relating to temporal affairs, were given on purpose to supply the Absence and Omission of it?

If he should say, the Jews had a clear and satisfactory knowledge of a future state; either by Tradition, or immediate Revelation; then let him reconcile this supposition to the passages produced out of the new testament in the first Chapter of this examination.

He must explain too, why Moses and the Prophets were, in their preaching, limited and confined to the temporal Sanctions of the Law (a); if the doctrine of a future state was necessary to enforce the obedience of the people, and was intended for an additional Sanction of their Religion.

There is the less need to produce other testimonies, since the learned Writer himself owns, "that the doctrine

---

(a) See above, P. 42, and 3.

liberty of offering any objections on this head; or of supposing that the facts and circum-

“trine of a future state had not been delivered in a  
“clear, full, and satisfactory manner in the Law or in  
“the Prophets” (b). And what more clear, full, and  
satisfactory argument can be desired to prove that it nei-  
ther was originally appointed for the sanction of the Jew-  
ish Religion, nor afterwards revealed for this purpose?

He owns, that no clear and full Revelation was gi-  
ven by Moses or the Prophets; and he may probably per-  
ceive by this time, that nothing but such a clear and  
full Revelation will do his argument any service.

My design in this note was only to remind the learn-  
ed Dr, that he must encounter great and unsurmountable  
difficulties; if he shall undertake the defence of the  
Jewish Religion, on the supposition that a future state  
was necessary and essential to it. However, if he  
be able to discharge these several objections, or to  
strike out any new Lights in support of the old system,  
he has now a fair opportunity of restoring it to its old  
honours.

This learned Person and Dr. Law should both reflect; that  
they allow the Mosaic Covenant no SANCTIONS, but what  
are Temporal. Now this acknowledgment will eternally  
embarrass them, and put them under inextricable diffi-  
culties; if they should suppose the Jews had this doctrine  
of a future state, either by Tradition, or immediate Re-  
velation. It is surprizing they should not see, that the  
argu-

---

(b) Discourses on the Christian Religion, P. 181.



circumstances, which have been produced from the Jewish history for this purpose, will prove that the interpositions were not frequent and numerous enough to preserve the Religion of this people (a).

We have shewn, that Dr. Stebbing's principles will disable him from defending the miracles in question. It may now be proper to examine, how far he has invalidated, (as he has strenuously laboured the point in two large pamphlets,) the proof, which the author of the *D. L.* has brought to establish the Reality of these Miracles.

We are told, it will be dangerous to argue with Unbelievers, on the supposition that the Jewish Religion had not the sanction of a future state: for that this supposition will arguments, alledged to prove that this doctrine was delivered as the *Sanction* of the patriarchal Religion, will equally prove that it was delivered also as the *Sanction* of the Law.

(a) Dr. Leland maintains, that these interpositions were not frequent enough to supply the absence and omission of a future state; and therefore very consistently affirms, that they were not wrought for this purpose. On the other hand, Dr. Stebbing contends, that they were wrought for this very purpose; and yet were not frequent and numerous enough to answer it.

enable

enable them to convict it of falshood and imposture.

This is sometimes objected by Dr. Stillingfleet. However he owns, in the same breath, that there is a strict connexion between all extraordinary providence, and the omission of a future state (a). This Omission therefore, if allowed, will enable the author of the D. L. to prove the reality of that long series of Miracles, or divine interpositions, recorded in the old Testament.

It will then enable him to prove, that the Jewish Religion was all along administered and conducted, either by the immediate hand, or the immediate direction of God. And if he extends this confession from Unbelievers, is not the long controversy at an end? For what did he undertake, or what do they demand, further, or more than this?

They are at liberty to dispute, whether this religion was administered and conducted by God. But if the omission of this doctrine, which omission they allow, will prove that it was really administered and conducted by

(a) See the Argument of the D. L. &c. P. 84—5.

him; what excuse have they for continuing in their unbelief? There can be no room to question the equity and justice of the thing done, where God is allowed to be the Doer. After this is once supposed, all their other objections must of course fall to the ground; as God cannot act inconsistently with his nature and attributes.

Dr. Stebbing would dissuade the author of the *D. E.* from insisting on this topic; as it will only "furnish out more handles to un-believers (a)." But is it possible this topic should furnish more handles to unbelievers, while it cuts away the very ground of all, by establishing the reality of the extraordinary interpositions above-mentioned, or, which is the same thing, the divine administration of the Law?

The Deists were wont to object the omission of a future state, as a circumstance which was sufficient to impeach the pretended truth and divinity of the Jewish Religion. The Doctor advises them to renew their attack, and still to insist on this circumstance. They do this. He then tells them; that the divine

(a) Examination, p. 132.



administration of the Law, may be inferred from this very topic (b). It is evident he plays booty. But, is it for, or is it against Religion?

(b) Dr. Stilling pretends, that the author of the *D. L.* has furnished "Unbelievers with fresh handles;" by venturing to argue with them on the supposition, that the Jewish Religion was not established on the sanction of a future state. We have already observed the general force of this argument: let us now consider its particular force, as addressed to one certain writer, who speaks of the *miraculous history* of the old testament with great insolence and scorn.

We are to judge of past facts, says Mr. Hume, only by experience and our present observation. Now experience and our present observation do not inform us of any Religion, which subsisted without the doctrine of a future state. And as the appetites and passions of men have been the same, at all times and in all places, we must conclude, (if we take *experience and present observation* for our guide) that no Religion would ever have been able to subsist without it, *under a common and ordinary providence.*

What then are we to infer from *experience and observation*, but that the Jewish Religion was administer'd and supported by Miracles?

*Experience and observation*, therefore are so far from making us reject; that they oblige us to admit, the Existence of Miracles. And this is left with Mr. Hume, to consider at his leisure.

By

By advising them to insist on *this circumstance*, he obliges them to admit the miraculous and supernatural interpositions, recorded in the Old Testament. And will he after this advise them to deny the divinity of the Religion; which was administered and supported by them? This would be telling them, they must *suppose* it true; in order to *prove* it false.

So far on the Dr's own concessions it is shewn, that there can be *no danger* in arguing with unbelievers on the supposition that the *Jewish* Religion had not the doctrine of a future state. For how can it *be hurt* by a circumstance, which proves that it was really administered and dispensed by God?

There must be something strangely perplexed and confused in his ideas, to pretend that the omission of a future state would both furnish the Deist with fresh objections; and at the same time enable the author of the *D. L.* to prove that the Jewish Religion was supported by an extraordinary providence. For this is nothing less than affirming, that the very same circumstance, in the hands of one, will disprove, and in the hands of another, will establish, the reality of the miracles recorded in the Old Testament.

All these absurdities arise from his supposing, that there is a strict connexion between an extraordinary providence and the omission of a future state; or his allowing that the one may be inferred from the other. To give his argument an air of plausibility, he should have said; the *Jewish* Religion, if destitute of this doctrine, would have been unworthy of God; and therefore we must conclude, that he did not interpose to support it by miracles, or an extraordinary providence. He should, indeed, have disclaimed all connexion between these two things; and have declared, the one was incompatible with the other.

However, as this extraordinary Providence did not descend so far as to punish and reward every observer and transgressor of the Law; he will say, perhaps, that many difficulties will occur on the supposition that the *Jewish* Religion had not the doctrine of a future state: To this let me observe; that these difficulties, even on the Dr's own concessions, are removed. For he owns, that an extraordinary providence, or the divine administration of the Law, may be inferred from the omission of a future state. Now if the extraordinary Providence, or the divine administration of the Law, be previously established; no difficulties,



culties, however plausible, or even inexplicable, they may be, can be supposed to have any weight against it<sup>a</sup>.

The excellent Dr. Clarke observes, "that the *eternity* and *immensity* of God are attended with great and insuperable *difficulties*; notwithstanding they are capable of demonstration<sup>b</sup>." Now if any one should allow his previous demonstration of these attributes, and afterwards urge these difficulties as a proof that it had no real solidity and force; Dr. Stebbing would be amongst the first to treat the futility of this cavil with the contempt that it deserves.

My design in these papers was not to consider the several objections, which have, or may be, alledged against the argument of the *D. L.* but only to shew the impossibility of defending revealed Religion, on the supposition that the knowledge of a future state was always necessary and essential to the support of it.

But, as my Lord Bishop undertakes its defence on this principle; and maintains, that the doctrine of life and immortality was

<sup>a</sup> See a View of L. Bolingbroke's Philosophy, lett. iv. p. 24, 5.

<sup>b</sup> Defence of the letter to Dodwell, p. 190, &c. 5th Edition.

revealed immediately after the fall; in order to be the *sanction* of Religion, in that and the succeeding ages of the world; I will here enumerate some of the principal objections, which seem to lie against this opinion.

1. The followers of the *First philosophy* will ask; how the supposition of such an early revelation, can be reconciled to the passages of the New Testament, produced in the first chapter? And here they will have the malignant pleasure to observe, that my Lord Bishop's own exposition of some of these passages plainly and expressly declares, that the doctrine of life and immortality had been a mystery ever since the world began; and was originally revealed by Jesus Christ.

2. They will ask; how such a supposition can be reconciled to the accounts, which his Lordship has given of the ancient Prophecies? For he maintains, that *some* of them were contrived to cover and hide, and that *others* were appointed to supply the absence and omission, of this doctrine.

3. They will say; his Lordship is inconsistent, in supposing the doctrine was always necessary to the support of Religion; since he holds, that the worshipers of the true God, in the time of *Job*, limited the exercise of

\* See above.

divine



divine providence to the present life; without extending their prospect beyond the grave.

4. In support of this charge of inconsistency, they may urge some passages in his *Discourses on prophecy*; especially where he declares, that a plain and open exposition of the spiritual blessings promised in the Gospel, "would have carried the Jews beyond the bounds of knowledge, which God prescribed to that age."

5. Lastly, they will say; that the supposition of a plain and early revelation of a future state, will break in upon, and destroy the order and uniformity of the long chain of Prophecies so much insisted on by him.

Indeed, as his Lordship maintains, that God's covenant of life and immortality was revealed immediately after the Fall; he must hold, that the Patriarchal and Christian Religion were the same, as to their fundamental and essential articles; since both prescribed the worship of the one true God, and both were established on the sanction of eternal life. The consequence of this, is; that he must suppose, the final and ultimate Religion of the Gospel was revealed *before* the preparatory and introductory system of the Law.

What occasion could there be to put the Jews under the servile regimen of a



preparatory and introductory System; if they were duly qualified and prepared to receive the grand article of the final and ultimate?

Would not the revelation of this article have been premature; as it must have tempted the *Jews* to shake off their obedience to the hard and galling yoke of the *Mosaic Law*?

Would it not be absurd in my Lord Bishop to suppose a future state was intended for the sanction of all, or of any the revelations preceding the Gospel; since he contends, that they all left it *involved in doubts and uncertainties*?

As he holds, that the principle of the Resurrection was necessary to establish the doctrine of a future state; he must either give up the *Patriarchal* and *Jewish* Dispensations, or prove that the Resurrection is as plainly and distinctly revealed in the Pentateuch, as in the books of the New Testament.

He asserts, that the ancient Jews had the knowledge of life and immortality; at the expence of many of the miracles recorded in the Old Testament. For he contends, that these miracles were only necessary to supply the absence and omission of this doctrine.

He seems to evacuate the whole temporal Covenant, by the assertion just mentioned.

For

For if, according to his Lordship's supposition, the Christian Covenant, with its grand promise of life and immortality, was revealed so long before the Law; such foreign and adventitious helps, as a *temporal Covenant*, and a *Theocracy*, would have been no more necessary then; than they were in the ages of the Gospel.

To say the temporal and spiritual Covenants were revealed together, to the ancient Jews; would be saying, that the *rudiments* and *elements*, and the most *sublime* branches of science, or the *doctrine of perfection*, were properly taught to the same persons at the same time.

Many more considerations may be deduced from the foregoing sheets, to shew the impossibility of defending revealed Religion, on the supposition that a future state was always necessary and essential to the support of it. Whenever these objections are discharged to the satisfaction of the Public, I shall readily acquiesce in his Lordship's system. All my view is, to get the question fairly and impartially examined; and therefore I have often addressed myself to two ingenious and learned writers<sup>c</sup>, who seem to be well qualified for this task. I have no objection to suppose

<sup>c</sup> Dr. Fortin and Dr. Law.

a future state has always been necessary and essential to Religion; if so be they are able to prove, that it was always as *plainly* and *explicitly* delivered, as the SANCTION of a revealed system ought to be. If they can produce no proof that it was thus plainly and explicitly revealed, it may be dangerous to assert its necessity; as this would be pointing out to the Deists an easy and effectual way of impeaching the divinity and truth both of the patriarchal and Jewish Dispensations.

To conclude, in the words of a very excellent person, "If I have argued amiss, "I shall surely hear of it. Every man of "common sense is judge of these arguments; "and I only wish, they may be impartially "examined."

ADDENDA.



## A D D E N D A.

Note 1. *To be added in chapter 1. page 11. line 15.*

Dr. Stebbing seems to be sensible, that if our Saviour was a light to the Jews, or that if they were a people sitting in darkness, and in the region and shadow of death; we shall be obliged to deny them the revealed doctrine of life and immortality. He contends therefore that the GENTILES were the people sitting in the region and shadow of death, and that Jesus Christ was sent to be a light to them only, exclusive of the Jews. "Christ is said to be a light to the Gentiles, but I do not remember any passage in which Christ is characterized as a light to the Jews." (*Examination*, p. 74.)

What will he say to the passage, in which St. Paul declares, "that Christ came to shew light unto the PEOPLE, and the GENTILES?" (*Acts* xxvi. 23.) It may seem extraordinary that he should not remember this passage, since he quotes the adjoining verses in the very next page. He does indeed quote them to prove, in direct contradiction to this passage, that "Christ did not come to shew light unto the People, as well as the Gentiles."

According to the Lord Bishop of London, St. Peter tells all Christians, Jews as well as Gentiles, "that they are called out of darkness into God's marvelous light."

St. John, evidently addressing himself to the Jewish converts, declares that "the darkness is past, and the true light now shineth." (*1 John* ii. 8.)

We are told, that "Jesus Christ is a light, which lighteneth every man." Upon what grounds or authority therefore does the Doctor restrain the words, every man, to the Gentiles, exclusive of the Jews?

\* *Discourses on prophecy*, p. 7, 8.

† *John* i. 9.

Accord-

Accordingly the word, *ἐκδηλωτες*, *enlightened*, is applied to the *Jews*, (*Hebrews*, vi. 4, 10, 32.)

“ The day-spring from on high hath visited us.”

“ To give light to them that sit in darkness, and in the shadow of death; to guide our feet in the way of peace\*.

Our feet, or the feet of the *Jews*, are said to wander in darkness; and therefore they must have been the people, sitting in the shadow of death.

“ I will give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles.”

“ To open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house.” (*Isaiab*, xlii. 6, 7.) We shall be told, this was only a description of the Gentiles: but if we may believe *St. Paul*, the *Jews* also were in the same situation, i. e. *shut up in a prison-house*, before the coming of our Saviour. “ But before Faith came, we were kept under the Law, *shut up* unto the faith, which should afterwards be revealed †.” Mr. Locke paraphrases these words in the following manner; “ But before Christ, and the doctrine of justification by faith in him came, we *Jews* were shut up as a company of prisoners together under the custody and inflexible rigour of the Law, &c.

The Apostle declares that the *Jews*, before the coming of our Saviour, were *pent* and *shut up in prison*: And the Prophet informs us, that the persons, confined in prison, *sat in darkness*, and that their eyes were *blind*, and wanted opening.

“ Arise, shine (or be enlightened) for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee †.” Now as these words were addressed to the Jewish church, do they not plainly intimate that Christ was to be the light, as well as the glory of his people Israel; and that they were to be enlightened by him as well as the Gentiles?

The Doctor seems much to triumph in the expression, “ that Christ was a light to lighten the Gentiles, and

\* *Luke*, i. 78, 79. † *Gal.* iii. 2, 3. † *Isaiab*, lx. 1.

“ was



“ was the *glory* of his people Israel \*,” as, if the *light* and the *glory* were things specifically different. But does not *Isaiah*, in the passage above quoted, make them one and the same?

And indeed what was the *glory* but a bright and splendid light? “ Arise, shine (or be enlightened) for the *glory* of the Lord is risen upon thee,” — is a plain allusion to the day-star rising to diffuse his light, and shed his influence on a dark and benighted world.

The *glory* was to rise upon them, and they were to shine, or be enlightened, by it.

“ The Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light †, and thy God thy *glory*.”

Here the Lord is said to be both the *light*, and the *glory* of the Jews. Indeed the Doctor did not apprehend that the idea of *light*, was included in the word *glory*; and consequently did not see that the *glorious light*, called the *shekinah*, which settled upon the tabernacle, and was declarative of the divine presence, is here alluded to.

In a word, Dr. Stebbing was the last man, that should have insisted on this distinction, as he contends that the doctrines exhibited under types were purposely secreted and concealed from the ancient *Jews*. For if the great and leading principles of the Gospel had been covered and enveloped in such thick darkness, the person, who clearly and perfectly revealed them, must have been a *light* to the *Jews*, as well as *Gentiles*.

Note 2. Chapter i. page 22. line 16.

Let us attend to the several positions advanced by his Lordship in the passage above cited. “ The whole design of the Gospel is styled a mystery; the *hidden wisdom* of God, which was kept secret, since the world began.”

Now what was the *design* of the Gospel, but the restoration of mankind to the lost inheritance of eternal life? This restoration therefore, according to his Lordship, must have been a mystery during the ages preceding the Gospel.

\* Examination, p. 74.

† *Isaiah*, lx. 19.



If you say, this restoration was not *the whole* of the Gospel; I reply, that the Gospel must necessarily include every important and essential article of the christian faith. Since therefore this restoration was one of these essential articles, it must have been a mystery, if the whole Gospel was so.

When his Lordship therefore affirms that the Law afforded a *good proof* of a future life \*, *i. e.* of a restoration to this lost inheritance, and supposes that nothing more than the particular article of the resurrection was reserved to be revealed by Jesus Christ, he, in effect, declares, that *the whole design of the Gospel was* NO mystery; in contradiction to his own representation of the scripture doctrine.

A mystery 'tis called, because it was kept secret since "the world began, God not having opened or declared "his *gracious purposes* before the coming of Christ."

What can his Lordship mean by these *gracious purposes*, but "the *grace* and *purpose* which God had given us in "Christ Jesus before the world?" And if his Lordship holds that this *grace* and *purpose* was a mystery before the coming of Christ; what has he to object to Dr. Warburton's interpretation of this text?

If we limit the new revelation of Jesus Christ to the particular doctrine of the resurrection, we shall limit it to a particular and small part of this *gracious purpose* and *design*. — "With respect to this time of *secrecy* and "silence the Gospel is called a mystery."

How could this be called a time of *secrecy* and *silence* with respect to the Gospel, if the Law offered a *good proof* of a future life, which was the grand and essential article of the Gospel?

It ought not surely to be styled a time of *secrecy* and *silence* with respect to the Gospel, because the article of the resurrection, or *one particular* doctrine of the Gospel, was not published and promulged in it.

However his Lordship insists withal, that, even in these ages of *secrecy* and *silence*, the redeemer of mankind was manifestly described by the prophets; "that the time

\* Sixth Sermon, vol. i.

“ and place of his birth were appointed, his great  
“ works, his glories, and his sufferings were foretold \*.”

We shall indeed find that his Lordship has been very liberal to these ages of *secrecy* and *silence*, if we recollect that he supposes, in his *second* Dissertation, that even the doctrine of the resurrection had been revealed in the age of *Job*, if not much sooner, or about the time of the flood †.

— “ To him (says the Apostle) that is of power to  
“ establish you according to my gospel, and *the preach-*  
“ *ing of Jesus Christ*, according to the revelation of the  
“ mystery, which was kept secret since the world  
“ began; but now is made manifest, and by the scrip-  
“ tures of the prophets, according to the commandment of  
“ the everlasting God, made known to all nations for  
“ the obedience of faith ‡.”

On these words, his Lordship observes as follows,  
“ This great work was a mystery in all ages, being kept  
“ secret in the counsels of God; but, since the coming  
“ of Christ, 'tis no longer a mystery, but is manifest  
“ and made known to all nations and people.”

Well then, if St. *Paul* asserts in his epistle to the *Romans*, that this mystery was first manifested by *the preaching of Jesus Christ*; I think that he might reasonably hold, in his epistle to *Timothy*, that life and immortality were brought to light by him, in the strict and proper sense of those words.

His Lordship affirms, and proves, p. 132, 3. that *the whole Gospel* is often styled a mystery; he proceeds to observe that the several parts of it are styled so too, p. 134, 5. He then adds, “ In this sense the Gospel is full  
“ of mysteries, as containing the secret purposes of  
“ God's hidden wisdom in the redemption of the world,  
“ which were made manifest by *Christ Jesus*, who  
“ brought life and immortality to light ||.”

The secret purposes of God's hidden wisdom in the redemption of the world, can mean only what St. Paul in the

\* *Discourses on prophecy*, p. 145, 6. 151.

† *Ibid.* p. 237, 8. ‡ *Romans*, xvii. 25, 26.

|| *Sermons*, vol. i. p. 134.



epistle to Timothy calls "The *grace and purpose* which God gave us in Christ Jesus before the world." Now if his Lordship allows that this *grace and purpose* was a *mystery*, he must confess that there was NO GOOD PROOF of redemption and a future state in the Law.

If this *grace and purpose* remained a *mystery*, the doctrine of life and immortality was not merely *illustrated* and *enlightened*, but *brought to light* in the strict sense of the words by Jesus Christ. When his Lordship therefore was attempting to shew, that the word; *Quæstio* will not bear this sense, he is attempting to shew that it will not bear the sense which St. Paul, Suidas, Stephens, and what is more than all, himself has evidently assigned to it.

What was the *secret purpose* of God's *hidden wisdom*, which was made manifest *by bringing life and immortality to light*? It could be only his design of redeeming mankind. Now if this design had continued a *mystery* or *secret*, the doctrine of life and immortality could not be revealed. For how could men have been ignorant of God's design of redeeming, if they had been taught the doctrine of redemption.

According to his Lordship's own interpretation, the *mystery* of God's purpose of redeeming mankind was discovered by bringing life and immortality to light. Life and immortality therefore must either have been the *whole*, or a very great and essential part of the Gospel *mystery*.

It seems strange his Lordship should contend, that God's purpose of redeeming mankind *was a mystery*, and that this *mystery* was discovered by bringing life and immortality to light; and should yet contend that this life and immortality *was not a mystery*.

---

Note 3. Chapter i. page 39. line 5.

"According to the revelation of the *mystery* which was kept secret *since the world began*; but now is made manifest." Rom. xvi. 25, 26.

I am



I am told, that the words, *since the world began*, signify no more, than since the beginning of the *secular times*, or the times *under the Law*. For that this is the meaning of *αιωνες*, and *χρονος αιωνος* in other places of the New Testament, which relate to this subject. And here I am referred to 1 Cor. ii. 7. Titus i. 2. 2 Tim. i. 9. Ephes. iii. 9. Luke i. 70.

It might be sufficient to reply, that as I am here arguing on my Lord Bishop's own concessions, I may fairly assume his exposition of the phrase in question, without concerning myself to remove the objections which are brought against it.

In the first of these passages, St. Paul speaks of "the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory," 1 Cor. ii. 7. Now this *hidden wisdom* was the scheme of our redemption by Jesus Christ. But would St. Paul, when designing to set forth the great and superlative excellence of this scheme, say, that it was formed *before the secular ages of the Law*, and not before *the beginning of the world*? Is it not usual for the sacred writers to speak of it as intended and designed before the grand *era of creation*?

St. Paul says, "God chose us in Christ, not only before the Law, but even before the foundation of the world \*;" *προ καταβολης κοσμου*.

St. Peter and St. John speak of the redemption of mankind by Jesus Christ, as having been ordained in the counsels and decrees of God *προ* and *απο καταβολης κοσμου* †.

Thus, the names of men are said to have been written in the book of Life *απο καταβολης κοσμου* †.

Another of the objected passages, is, Titus i. 2. "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." And what was this promising (*i. e.* determining to promise) eternal life, but the *eternal purpose* and decree, by which God chose us in Christ *προ καταβολης κοσμου*?

\* Ephes. i. 4.

† 1 Pet. i. 20. Revel. xiii. 8.

† Revel. xvii. 8.

The third of these passages, is, 2 *Tim.* i. 9. "According to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in *Christ Jesus*, before the world began."

The purpose and grace, given us in *Christ Jesus*, must be the same with our election by God in *Christ*, or our predestination to eternal life, in virtue of the Lamb, fore-ordained, or slain from the foundation of the world, mentioned *Ephes.* i. 4. 1 *Peter* i. 20. *Rev.* xiii. 8.

Now, it would be ridiculous to interpret these passages as signifying only from the commencement, or beginning of the Jewish Law.

In this passage of the Epistle to Timothy, St. Paul is evidently speaking of the Scripture doctrine of predestination or the election, which God originally made of mankind in *Jesus Christ*. And would it not be low and trifling to say, that this had been projected and designed in the divine counsels and decrees, before the institution of the Jewish Law?

Dr. Benson indeed pretends, that it would be much for St. Paul's purpose, to assert, that God intended the offer of life and immortality before the Law was given, because this would prove against the *Judaizers*, that it could not depend on the observation of the Law\*. But would not his argument have been equally pertinent and conclusive, if he was supposed to tell the *Gentiles*, that they had been elected in *Christ* before the foundation of the world; as if he was only supposed to say, that they had been elected in *Christ*, before the time of the Jewish Law? And does not the analogy of Scripture oblige us to prefer the first of these senses? The other three texts produced above, are, *Ephes.* iii. 9. *Luke* i. 70. *Acts* iii. 21.

"And to make all men see, what is the fellowship of the mystery, which, from the beginning of the world, hath been hid in God, who created all things in *Jesus Christ*," *Ephes.* iii. 9.

Who created all things in *Jesus Christ*. Mr. Locke observes, that St. Paul here speaks of the new creation by *Jesus Christ*. This new creation then, was the manifestation of the mystery, which had been hid in God from the beginning of the world. Now, that this new creation in

\* Benson on 2 *Tim.* i. 9, 10.



*Christ* had been predestinated from the beginning of the world, in the strict and exact sense of the words, has been sufficiently proved by the passages above-quoted. *Ephes. i. 4. 1 Pet. i. 20. Rev. xiii. 8.*

St. Paul, in the next verse but one tells us, that this mystery was, "according to the eternal purpose which God had purposed in *Christ Jesus*." He has also informed us in the first chapter (even according to Mr. *Locke's* own interpretation) that this eternal purpose was made, "not only before the Law, but even before the foundation of the world."

*Luke i. 10.* runs thus; "As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began." The very same words are repeated, *Acts iii. 21.* In these passages, therefore, the word *also* evidently takes in the whole period of the ancient Prophecies, and consequently must extend beyond the age of the Law, if any Prophecies were given before this period.

Note 4. Chap. i. page 72. line 11.

We are told, "that the divine Laws, especially those of the Christian dispensation, are chiefly a declaration of the natural and necessary effects of sin—given to forewarn us of the natural consequences of our own acts and habits, and to prevent those moral evils, to which we are exposed by the very constitution of our being."

"If heaven be not so much the reward of religion, as the natural consequence of a religious frame of mind, and vice versa; then how absurd is it \*," &c.

If heaven be only the natural consequence of a religious frame of mind, it will follow, that the sacrifice of *Christ* was superfluous and unnecessary. There was only occasion for a divine Teacher, to point out, and lay open this natural and necessary connexion between virtue and eternal happiness.

"Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have enter'd into the heart of man, the things which God has prepared for them that love him." *1 Cor. ii. 9.* Had not the bliss and glory of heaven in-

\* *Notes on King on the Origin of Evil*, p. 495, 6. ed. iii.



initely exceeded the *natural effect* of human virtue, it never would have been described in so pompous and magnificent a manner.

It is still more difficult to suppose, that the Scripture doctrine of future punishments, was chiefly a *declaration of the natural effect of vice*. For, on this supposition, we must conclude, that they, who never heard of the Gospel, are liable to much the same punishment with those who live under it. And yet, this seems repugnant both to the voice of Reason and Scripture. Our Saviour certainly knew nothing of this connexion, when he said, "The servant who knew his Lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes \*."

The learned translator of *King* asserts the *eternity* of future punishments †. Now, if this revelation was given to forewarn us of the *natural effects of vice*, it will follow, that *eternal* punishment was one of its *natural effects*. And if so, it ought to have been promulged long before the publication of the Gospel. For men could not be liable to those eternal punishments, till the doctrine had been revealed to them.

Whether the punishments, mentioned in the New Testament, are, or are not properly eternal; it is allowed on all hands, that they are much greater than those discovered by the light of nature. The question, therefore, will return, why were they not revealed sooner? For the followers of Lord Bolingbroke will say, that God actually deceived men, if he did not set before them the full consequences of their disobedience.

According to this hypothesis, the great end of *Revelation*, was to point out, and lay open the natural connexion between virtue and happiness, and vice and misery. The *revelation*, therefore, ought to have been universal, or to have extended to all times and places. For it would impeach the goodness, and even justice of God, to suppose, that he intended to inflict punish-

\* Luke xii. 47, 48.

† P. 447.

ments which had not been revealed, and were not discoverable by the light of nature.

As it was not therefore consistent with the justice of God, ever to leave men without the revelation given in the Gospel; what will become of the *progressive* scheme asserted by this learned writer, in which he supposes, that this revelation of the Gospel had been gradually opened and unfolded from the time of *Adam*, to that of *Jesus Christ*? For, the part of it relating to *future* punishments, should have been perfectly revealed from the beginning, that men might have fair warning of the situation in which they stood.

Note 5. Chap. iii. page 169, line 6.

“*Eliphaz* appears quite astonished, and asks *Job* where he had *this knowledge*, whether he had the *secret of God*, and had engrossed all wisdom to himself; he tells him, they were no strangers to the ways of God, but had heard as much from their fathers, as *Job*: though he pretended to the knowledge of such *secret things*. *Art thou the first man that was born? Or wast thou made before the hills? Hast thou heard the secret of God? And dost thou restrain wisdom to thyself? What knowest thou that we know not? What understandest thou which is not in us?*”

“After this strong expostulation, he returns to his old argument, and offers many proofs from ancient tradition, of *God's immediate vengeance upon the wicked*.”

But whence does it appear, that the *secret*, which occasioned this strong expostulation, was the knowledge of the resurrection and a future state? Or, why might it not be the notion of an unequal or ordinary Providence; which his Lordship assures us, had been asserted by *Job*, and denied by his friends? This will be no improbable supposition; if the principal point in dispute, between him and his friends, was, *whether the afflictions of this world, are certain marks of God's displeasure, and an indication of the wickedness of those that suffer!*

\* Discourses on prophecy, p. 242.



The context too seems to lead us to this sense, since *Eliphaz*, after his expostulation, proceeds to offer many proofs of God's immediate vengeance on the wicked.

"The next (says his Lordship) who answers *Job*, is *Bildad*.—He talks in the same strain, and reproaches *Job* with his pretence to secret knowledge above others. Wherefore, says he, are we counted as beasts, and reputed vile in your sight? chap. xviii. 3. And because *Job* had talked as if the heavens should cease to be, and that the earth and its inhabitants should fail, and the rock be removed out of his place; *Bildad* thinks him distracted even with passion, and reproaches him with his wild conceit. He tearath himself in his anger; shall the earth be forsaken for thee, and shall the rock be removed out of his place?" chap. xviii. 4. As if he had said, "What is this wonderful man, that he expects to see all things destroyed, the earth and the heavens to pass away, that there may be a proper time to do him justice? Is it not more reasonable to think, that God will do justice here, than that all the works of nature should be destroyed, to make way for judgment?" He then proceeds, "Yea, the light of the wicked shall be put out, and the spark of his fire shall not shine." ver. 5.

What *Bildad* means by removing the rock out of his place, appears to be *Job's* pleading for the cessation of the extraordinary Providence. For since *Bildad*, according to his Lordship, asserts such a Providence; and makes it consist in distributing good and evil to merit and demerit, which he considers as the *immoveable* terms of intercourse between God and man; the denying and disturbing such a dispensation of things, is elegantly called *the removing the rock from its place*. And his proceeding immediately to assert the temporal punishment of the wicked fully supports this interpretation.

All then his Lordship has proved, is, that *Job's* friends reproached him with pretending to be wiser than all men, and arrogating to himself the secret of God. But, that this charge arose from his asserting the doctrine of the resurrection and a future state, is only supposed, and not proved.



I was a little surprized, indeed, to find his Lordship affirming, that this knowledge was *peculiar to Job*, and a *secret* to his friends: But much more, to find him deserted by his old friend, Dr. Stebbing; who maintains, that this doctrine was the *common traditional* exposition of the *Abrahamic Covenant*. For, if this were the case, it could not possibly be unknown to *Job's* friends; who, indeed, from the whole course and tenour of the book, seem to be rather better acquainted with the ancient dispensations of Providence to mankind, than even *Job* himself. But, his Lordship has here the mortification even of a *general desertion*; for not only the ingenious and learned Dr. Grey, but even his Chaplain, Dr. Brown, supposes this was a common doctrine; and, as such, no better known to *Job*, than to his friends. They will therefore be much embarrassed in the defence of his Lordship's exposition. For, by supposing that *Job's* friends were well acquainted with the doctrine of the resurrection, they deprive his Lordship of the only argument, which he thinks sufficient to repel the objection brought against this interpretation of the text.

The great difficulty to be accounted for, is; how *Job* came to be so well acquainted with this doctrine, while it remained a secret to his friends? His Lordship observes; that, in the age of *Job*, "there might possibly be among the few faithful in the world, a traditional exposition of the promises of God; grounded upon more express revelations, made either before, or soon after the Flood, than have come down to our times \*."

Now it happens, that *Job's* friends were amongst the faithful of those times; and therefore, according to the present supposition, could be no strangers to this doctrine; if it had been the *common traditional* exposition of the revelations above-mentioned. His Lordship supposes the exposition to have been *common to the few faithful*, as he assigns it to them without distinction.

The thing to be explained, is; how this knowledge came to be *peculiar to Job*, and the reason here assigned implies, that it was *not peculiar to Job*, but *common to the few faithful* of those times.

\* P. 237, 238.

His Lordship proceeds, "Or, as *Job* was tryed in a very extraordinary manner, he might have as extraordinary a degree of light, to support and maintain him in the conflict." Here he supposes, that *such* an extraordinary degree of light as the knowledge of a future state, was only necessary to support men under great and extraordinary trials. He must suppose too, that neither *Job*, nor the faithful of those times, had any knowledge of a future state before this special revelation was made. He must acknowledge, therefore, that there has been a time, when Religion was able to subsist unsupported by this doctrine.

Here too we are unable to reconcile what we learn of his Lordship. He tells us, that the sentence pronounced upon our first parents, returned them to the dust of the earth; and that Religion after this, would have had no real foundation and support, unless the promise of a deliverance from the curse of the fall, or of a restoration to life and immortality, had been immediately revealed. How then was Religion able to subsist among *Job* and his friends, (who were acquainted with the history of the fall) before the doctrine of a future state was revealed to them?

It will be necessary therefore for his Lordship, either to give up his exposition of this first and original Prophecy, or his interpretation of the celebrated text in the book of *Job*; i. e. either to abandon the fundamental point he labours to inculcate in his *third Discourse*, or that other, which he endeavours to support in his *second Dissertation*.

I beg leave to conclude this note with a remark on the following criticism. "When a man gives up the Ghost, where is he? The meaning of which question is explained in the following words; for man lieth down, and riseth not till the heavens be no more. Where is he then, or what is he, in the intermediate space? You may reply perhaps; that this expression, till the heavens be no more, may very well signify that man shall never rise more; and to shew the contrary, it ought at least to be proved that *Job* had a notion that the

\* Vide *Third Discourse on Prophecy*.

" heavens



“ heavens should one day be destroyed; and that new  
 “ heavens and a new earth should succeed. But if  
 “ this expression be doubtful, yet 'tis reasonable to ex-  
 “ pound it to the sense, which antient tradition best  
 “ supports. And this we certainly know from writers,  
 “ both sacred and profane; that it was a very old opinion,  
 “ that the present frame of nature should be one day dis-  
 “ solved; and be succeeded by a renovation of all things,  
 “ by new heavens, and a new earth \*.”

His Lordship is certainly right in observing, that an  
 objector may probably demand; upon what warrant and  
 authority he affirms, that this opinion of a general reno-  
 vation, or of new heavens and a new earth, was as old  
 as the time of *Job*. And what answer does his Lordship  
 make? Why, he asserts; that the opinion was very  
 old. But this is not enough. He should prove that it was  
 as old as the age of *Job*. Now as he has not attempted  
 to do this, he seems to beg the question, which he  
 should have proved.

But, what is still more remarkable, his own reasoning  
 will not allow him to suppose; that such an opinion pre-  
 vailed so early as the time of *Job*. For on this suppo-  
 sition how can he suppose, that the knowledge of it was  
 peculiar to *Job*, and a secret to his friends?

\* P. 225.

F I N I S.





- Page Line
2. 8. for of the one as of the other r. of their religion then, as it is of ours now
13. 8. del. for
13. 10. he then r. then he
25. 25. del. distinctly
16. 18. they r. the types
17. 22. them r. him
55. 14. distinction r. destruction
- End of the Note, add Dodderidge. Rom. vi. 6. "The word *anacyonai* generally signifies, divesting a thing of some power, whether lawful or usurped, which it formerly had, and reducing it to an incapacity of exerting that energy any more." Dodderidge, 1 Cor. xv. 24.
58. Note 1. to r. of
59. 11. says the Prophet Isaiah, r. says Hezekiah in the Prophet Isaiah.
- Note 5. the citation r. his citation
65. Note 2. after redemption, ~~is/ere~~ we shall only be the more puzzled to account for his perplexity and embarrassment on this occasion
66. Note 10. derives r. denies
79. 13. religions r. religion
82. 5, 6. that it was intended r. that was intended for this purpose.
- Note 1. this, Vol. iii. p. 479, 480. 578, 579
- Vol. i. p. 447, 8.
96. 11. it r. or
109. Note 18. he closely follows r. thus he closely follows
28. Reasoners r. Reasoning,
113. 10. by not letting r. as he did not let
117. 10. same r. time
120. 16. who saw the doctrine r. who saw, or ought to have seen the doctrine
133. 2. it r. them
136. 23. for they had taken r. for as they have taken
157. 5. he will r. God will
160. Note 2. Prop. 2. r. page 102.
168. 14. the resurrection to be r. the resurrect on and a future state to be
171. 24. in Job r. on Job
175. 11, 12. in being considered r. or in being considered
176. 6. interpretations r. interpreters
177. 20. New Testament r. Old and New Testament



# ERRATA

- Page Line
179. 13. since the two first were as much embarrassed with this circumstance of the inequality, and the other was as utter a stranger to the doctrine of the resurrection, as if they had never seen any plain description or *revelation* of this grand article of the Gospel.
19. considerable important, considerable and important
215. Note 4. see the publication, see since the publication
217. 1. for interpretation put a colon
218. Note 1. every doctrine, every principle
228. 24, 5, 6. Whether the doctrine of eternal life had been revealed before the Law, or no, & Whether the doctrine of eternal life was to be propagated and dispensed by the *Mosaic Law*.
254. 13. *del* likewise
256. Note penult. the required faith, the faith required
257. 17. not so fully opened, was not so fully opened
271. 9. add I am only reasoning on my Lord Bishop's own concessions, or urging an argument *ad hominem*, when I say Religion must have subsisted before this time; exclusively of which the *D. L.* holds, that it had for some centuries been a national doctrine amongst the ancient *Jews*.
298. Note 7. See p. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.
299. 14. & but condescends to admit it, as to the *legal* covenant.
316. Note 8. & future state
- Note 7. p. 5, 18, 19, &c.
331. 3. BEFORE & AFTER
- who saw the doctrine, who saw the doctrine, who saw the doctrine
- for as they have taken law
- he will God with
- the reference to be
- of being considered
- New Testament, Old and New Testament



Pref. Dr. Parker.

2 Dr. Warburton a celebrated Writer } 129  
By great & illustrious Writers  
24 Dr. Rutherford. 300

37 Dr. Jortin. 63. 80. 126. 124. III. 328. 344.

60 Dr. Law. 369. 103. 138. 199. 227. 234. 241. 262. 270. 274. 289. 389. 398. 340.

47 Dr. Benson 367

50 Dr. Stelling 361

95 Dr. W. a myster-critic.

59 Dr. Tykes 122. 142. 326.

57 Mr. Peters 301

43 Dr. Leland 108. 263. 331

278 Dr. Louth

215 Dr. Brown

156 Dr. Grey

143 Mr. Hurd, a very great writer &c.

330 Mr. Adams

226 Mr. Costard

165 Mr. Heath